

All Given and All Received: the Foundation of Mystical Union in the *Deus in se* of
Aquinas' *Summa theologiae*

A paper for the "Franz von Baader: Writings and Sources of a Christian Mystic",
Independent Reading Group in the Institute for the Public Life of the Arts and
Ideas at McGill University

February 19, 2014

Wayne J. Hankey

Carnegie Professor and Chairman, Department of Classics with the Programmes
in Religious Studies and Arabic, Dalhousie University and King's College,
Halifax

I. *Ipsum esse subsistens* is a real Giving and Receiving of Itself to Itself

Very being [*ipsum esse subsistens*] is real, not notional, giving [*dare*] and receiving [*accipere*] of itself to itself. This giving and receiving of infinite being forming three infinite subsistences, makes understandable, though not by a compelled necessity, the emanation of finite beings, creation. Prior to that procession, and its basis, is what Thomas calls "the mission of the Divine Persons". This is where what has come to be called "mystical experience" enters, with the language of touching, common to the tradition from Plato and Aristotle, and, crucially for Aquinas, to Plotinus¹ and Augustine², "attingit ad ipsum Deum":

... God is in all things by His essence, power and presence, according to His one common mode, as the cause existing in the effects which participate in His goodness. Above and beyond this common mode, however, there is one special mode consonant with the nature of a rational being in whom God is said to be present as the known in the knower, and the beloved in the lover. And because the rational creature by its operation of knowledge and love touches God Himself, according to this

¹ *Ennead* 6.9.4: οὐ γὰρ δὴ ἄπεστιν οὐδενὸς ἐκεῖνο καὶ πάντων δέ, ὥστε παρὼν μὴ παρεῖναι ἀλλ' ἢ τοῖς δέχεσθαι δυναμένοις καὶ παρεσκευασμένοις, ὥστε ἐναρμόσαι καὶ οἶον ἐφάψασθαι καὶ θίγειν ὁμοιότητι καὶ τῇ ἐν αὐτῷ δυνάμει συγγενεῖ τῷ ἀπ' αὐτοῦ. McKenna (modified): "From none is the One absent and yet from all: present, it remains absent save to those fit to receive, disciplined into some accordance, able to touch it closely by their likeness and by that kindred power within themselves through which, remaining as it was when it came to them from the One." It is remarkable how much of the Plotinian doctrine comes down intact to Aquinas.

² See *Confessions* 9.10.25: *attingimus aeternam sapientiam* and 9.10.24: *attingimus eam modice toto ictu cordis*. On the relation between Augustine and Plotinus on the language of mystical experience see Saint Augustine, *Confessions*, translated with an Introduction and Notes by Henry Chadwick (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1991), 127.

special mode God is said not only to exist in the rational creature but also to dwell therein as in His own temple. No other effect than sanctifying grace is able therefore to be the explanation that a divine person would be able in a new mode to be present to a rational creature.³

Beginning with the structure of *ipsum esse subsistens*, Thomas' *thearchy* unrolls and rewinds by way of linked concentric circular motions ever more inclusive of otherness until the *Summa theologiae*, if completed, would have described even the encircling of evil within the *mone, proodos, epistrophe* of Thomas' tripartite system of God, human, and Christ as the man-God. The circular motions returning upon themselves are of diverse kinds, and we must map them and their connections, but by far the most important are those which Aquinas deduces from the Proclean logic of simple substance.⁴

From the *Liber de causis* and Dionysius, he knows that simple substance has perfect self-return, a shape he has manifested, following Dionysius, in the initial questions on the divine names. In consequence, *ipsum esse subsistens* is, by the absolute necessity of its nature, knowing and willing.⁵ These two operations, processions or emanations—the terms are used more or less interchangeably by Aquinas for whom emanation was a Scriptural term (*Liber Sapientiae*, 7.25⁶)—are internal to the divine essence. By employing the notion of motionless motion,

³ *Summa theologiae* 1.43.3: *Est enim unus communis modus quo Deus est in omnibus rebus per essentiam, potentiam et praesentiam, sicut causa in effectibus participantibus bonitatem ipsius. Super istum modum autem communem, est unus specialis, qui convenit creaturae rationali, in qua Deus dicitur esse sicut cognitum in cognoscente et amatum in amante. Et quia, cognoscendo et amando, creatura rationalis sua operatione attingit ad ipsum Deum, secundum istum specialem modum Deus non solum dicitur esse in creatura rationali, sed etiam habitare in ea sicut in templo suo. Sic igitur nullus alius effectus potest esse ratio quod divina persona sit novo modo in rationali creatura nisi gratia gratum faciens.*

⁴ On which see K. Corrigan, "L'Auto-réflexivité et l'expérience humaine dans l'Ennéade V, 3 [49], et autres traités: de Plotin à Thomas d'Aquin," *Études sur Plotin*, éd. M. Fattal (Paris - Montreal: L'Harmattan, 2000): 149–172 and my "Between and Beyond Augustine and Descartes: More than a Source of the Self," *Augustinian Studies* 32:1 (2001): 65–88 at 84–85.

⁵ For the beginning of an analysis of the connection between physical circling and knowing as reflection, see Stephen Menn, "Self-Motion and Reflection: Hermias and Proclus on the Harmony of Plato and Aristotle on the Soul," in James Wilberding and Christoph Horn (eds.), *Neoplatonism and the Philosophy of Nature* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 44–67; at 65–67 Menn treats Aquinas whom he finds to be the first person using *reflexio* or *reflectio* "as something like a technical term."

⁶ See W.J. Hankey, "Ab uno simplici non est nisi unum: The Place of Natural and Necessary Emanation in Aquinas' Doctrine of Creation," in *Divine Creation in Ancient, Medieval, and Early Modern Thought: Essays Presented to the Rev'd Dr Robert D. Crouse*, edited by Michael Treschow, Willemien Otten and Walter Hannam, *Studies in Intellectual History* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 309–333 at 310. As a result emanation is used a term for the *proodos* more by Latin Christian theologians than by pagan Platonists.

through which the Neoplatonists reconciled Plato and Aristotle at their greatest difference, Aquinas is able to attribute the characteristics of Plotinian *NOUS* to Aristotle's (and his own) God as self-thinking thought and to predicate life of it.⁷ However, motionless motion is a metaphor for Aquinas—he always refuses to apply the proper Aristotelian physical motion to God. Nonetheless, the ascent to God begins with it in the *Quinque Viae* of *Summa theologiae* 1.2.3. There the circle of going out from and return to origin is primarily in the subject seeking cause.⁸

Despite a start of this kind, the divine self-diremption must be real. Thus, just before the treatment of the Trinitarian Missions, we get “*Et licet motus non sit in divinis, est tamen ibi accipere.*” [ST 1.42.1 ad 3]. *Accipere* and its correlative *dare* are essential to the logic of infinite *esse*, as the form under which it is, or contains, the relation of opposites. Such a relation is real, not merely “rational”, that is, a projection of human perspective, precisely because the differentiation of the essence is through opposition, action and reception. Thus, within the divine simplicity, the two relations of this kind must of necessity form subsistences, or

⁷ My interpretation here is fully within the later medieval Thomist tradition, especially as taken up along the Rhine in the *sillage* of Albertus Magnus and worked out in dialogue with the texts of Thomas by Eckhart, see Evan King, “*Bonum non est in Deo*: on the Indistinction of the One and the Exclusion of the Good in Meister Eckhart,” M.A. thesis Dalhousie University (2012), 80–101. I am deeply grateful to Evan for the interest he has taken in this paper and his help with it. My thanks is equally owed, and very willingly given, to the members of my seminar for 2012-13 who worked through Questions 1 to 45 of the *Summa theologiae* with me. Their work confirmed Thomas' judgment that the order of the *Summa* is the *ordo disciplinae*.

⁸ See my *God in Himself, Aquinas' Doctrine of God as Expounded in the Summa Theologiae*, Oxford Theological Monographs / Oxford Scholarly Classics (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987 / 2000), 141 & 142: “Thomas uses the causes to structure his writing only twice in the first forty-five questions of the *Summa theologiae*; in both cases he uses the same order. He places matter and form between the moving and final causes. Proper motion, as distinguished from activity generally, belongs to the material. When seen in relation to the divine causality, it involves a going out from simple immaterial being to matter which is raised to formal perfection as the good, or end, it lacks. In causing, God as the principle of all procession, i.e. the Father, knows the form by which he acts in [and as] the Son and loves the Son and himself as end in the Spirit. Thus understood, the order Thomas uses, in distinction from his sources in Aristotle, has a reason. The source of motion is the obvious beginning, just as its opposed cause, the final, is appropriate end....He says, glossing Aristotle, who also mentions their opposition, ‘motion begins from efficient cause and ends at final cause’ [In *Meta.* I.IV, 70]. ‘*Prima autem et manifestior via est, quae sumitur ex parte motus.*’ The moving cause is an obvious point from which to start the ways to God within a theology which also begins from him. Those ways ended: ‘*Ergo est aliquid intelligens, a quo omnes res naturales ordinantur a finem, et hoc dicimus Deum.*’ But ‘*intelligere et velle*’ are motions as ‘*actus perfecti*’ and as such display the ‘*rediens ad essentiam suam*’. This return is perfect in the divine being. Its *exitus* and *reditus* become fully manifest in the processions of persons founded in God's activities of knowledge and love; these in turn make intelligible the procession and return of creatures.”

hypostases, to use another word which is both Scriptural and Neoplatonic, called persons in religious language.⁹

In what follows I shall first outline reasons why we should look at Thomas' metaphysics of infinite being as including the whole fundamental structure of the *Deus in se*. I shall go on to say something about why we are able to do so, and shall then pass to what prevents such an obvious reading. Finally, I shall map the logic of *Ipsium Esse Subsistens* in the *Deus in se* of the *Summa theologiae* and indicate how it founds mystical experience and finite existence.

II. Why we should look for Thomas' metaphysics of infinite being through the whole *Deus in se*.

As well as disposing of the "personal God" which has been imposed on Aquinas in the grotesque re-anthromorphizing of divinity of the last two centuries, a fundamental logic of *esse* as poetic and receptive in itself is far more interesting metaphysically than the notion of *esse* as existential facticity.¹⁰ By contemplating the self-affectivity of *esse*, we would pass from that now barren rapprochement with Heidegger and its continuation in Christian anti Neoplatonic polemic to fruitful engagement with the Dominican tradition from Albertus Magnus to Meister Eckhart in the Middle Ages and with Michel Henry and his followers in contemporary philosophy—to say nothing of the scare name for Catholic medievalists, Hegel.¹¹ Considering the whole *de deo* as Aquinas' metaphysic of

⁹ See Hebrews 1.3.

¹⁰ See W.J. Hankey, "Making Theology Practical: Thomas Aquinas and the Nineteenth Century Religious Revival," *Dionysius* 9 (1985): 85–127, especially 99–100 & 105–106 and idem, "From Metaphysics to History, from Exodus to Neoplatonism, from Scholasticism to Pluralism: the fate of Gilsonian Thomism in English-speaking North America," *Dionysius* 16 (1998): 157–188. For a reassertion of the philosophical fecundity of Gilson's existential Thomism see D.J.M. Bradley, "Reading Thomas as a Theologian: The Hermeneutics of some Medievalists Old and New," *Dionysius* 25 (2007): 177–224 at 177.

¹¹ See on Michel Henry, to whom I owe the notion of self-affectivity as primary, my *One Hundred Years of Neoplatonism in France: A Brief Philosophical History*, Studies in Philosophical Theology (Leuven/Paris/Dudley, MA: Peeters, 2006), 209–215, idem, "The Ineffable Immediately Incarnate. Interplay between 20th century French Neoplatonism and Heidegger" for a conference on Heidegger and Theology at The Oxford Centre for Theology and Modern European Thought, Christ Church College, Oxford University, May 24, 2008 online at the Oxford University Research Archive [<http://ora.ouls.ox.ac.uk/objects/uuid%3A05c4da8d-d3f0-44c2-b29c-12f8392b00e9/>]. In contrast on Jean-Luc Marion, who despite all his nuances still wanders, with too many others, including Humbrecht, mostly in Gilson's metaphysical desert, supposing that this is the way out of the modern captivity of the Catholic Church to a new triumph, see my *One Hundred Years*, 201–209, idem, "Denys and Aquinas: Antimodern Cold and Postmodern Hot," *Christian Origins: Theology, Rhetoric and Community*, edited by Lewis Ayres and Gareth Jones, Studies in Christian

infinite *esse* also has the advantage of fidelity to his identification of *esse* and *essentia* in the simplicity of the infinite. In consequence, this approach enables us to understand the unrolling and rewinding of the thearchy as the explication of the infinite *essentia*.

Further, it does away with the grounds of a distorting polemic conducted in the last century from all sides of the Christian ecclesiastical spectrum: Eastern Orthodox, Protestant, and anti-metaphysical and anti-Augustinian Catholicism, against Thomas' treatment of God. The polemicists claimed that Aquinas' *de deo* subordinated the proper Christian theology of the Unknowable Trinity to philosophical knowledge of God as one and asserted that Aquinas followed Augustine in this. In fact the opposite is the case both in terms of historical influence and in terms of Thomas' understanding of the unity from which his treatise on God begins.¹²

Thomas does distinguish his treatment of God as one from his consideration of God as three. However, first, and crucially, in the *Summa theologiae* these are moments in a single treatise, not separated treatises.¹³ Second, he is explicit that the One from which he begins is unknowable—theology here is deeply negative, that God conforms to the mode of our knowing is continually denied. Finally, the distinction of the *de deo uno* from the *de deo trino* is explicitly, and correctly derived by Aquinas from the profoundly negative theology of Dionysius the Areopagite. Thomas' *de deo uno* has its justification and model in

Origins (London and New York: Routledge, 1998), 139–184 at 150–163, idem, “Philosophical Religion and the Neoplatonic Turn to the Subject,” *Deconstructing Radical Orthodoxy: Postmodern Theology, Rhetoric and Truth*, edited by Wayne J. Hankey and Douglas Hedley (Aldershot, England: Ashgate Press, 2005), Chapter 2, 17–30 at 20–21, idem, “Radical Orthodoxy’s *Poiêsis*: Ideological Historiography and Anti-Modern Polemic,” *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* 80:1 (Winter 2006): 1–21 at 9–13, idem, “Misrepresenting Neoplatonism in Contemporary Christian Dionysian Polemic: Eriugena and Nicholas of Cusa versus Vladimir Lossky and Jean-Luc Marion,” *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* 82:4 (2008): 683–703 at 701–703, and idem, “Jean-Luc Marion’s Dionysian Neoplatonism,” *Perspectives sur le néoplatonisme, International Society for Neoplatonic Studies, Actes du colloque de 2006*, édité par Martin Achard, Wayne Hankey, Jean-Marc Narbonne, Collection Zêtêsis (Québec: Les Presses de l’Université Laval, 2009), 267–280.

¹² See my “The *De Trinitate* of St. Boethius and the Structure of St. Thomas’ *Summa Theologiae*,” *Atti del Congresso Internazionale di Studi Boeziani*, ed. L. Obertello, (Roma: Herder, 1981), 367–375, idem, *God in Himself: Aquinas’ Doctrine of God as Expounded in the Summa Theologiae* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1987/2000), 12, idem, “Denys and Aquinas,” 162–173.

¹³ It is important to be clear that I am concerned with the logic of Aquinas’ *de deo* in the *Summa theologiae* which has the *ordo disciplinae* and not his other treatments. For example, he separates the *de deo uno* from the *de deo trino* in the *Summa contra Gentiles* because it is written for Dominican missionaries among either Christian heretics, or non-Christians, or both. See my *God in Himself*, 19–35.

The Divine Names of Dionysius, a treatise itself dependent on Proclus.¹⁴ In the initial questions of the *Summa theologiae* (3–11) Aquinas follows Dionysius both in beginning from the unknowable One,¹⁵ and in making the divine names circle upon themselves.¹⁶

We have in Aquinas' modification of Proclus, Dionysius, Augustine and Aristotle both a deeply interesting metaphysic and a distinctly Christian one. Aquinas, following Al-Ghazali and Maimonides, and in contradistinction from his 13th century Augustinian adversaries, like Bonaventure, predecessors like Anselm, and successors like Eckhart, Hegel, and Michel Henry, identifies some religious doctrines where philosophy cannot provide certain demonstration. He will deduce neither the Trinity, nor the creation, nor the Incarnation from the idea of God. Nonetheless, in the case of the Trinity, this is not because it is inessential to the logic of infinite *esse*. Rather, for Aquinas, although there is an analogy between the Trinitarian structure of human knowing and that of the divine, the likeness is not strong enough to enable a philosophical demonstration. Human reason must be aided by revelation in order to discover that the relations in God are real and form infinite and equal divine subsistences. Revelation is required for us to know that there is real *dare* and *accipere* in God and *gratia gratum faciens* is required for our conformity to the divine knowing and loving which our reception of them brings about. However, the submission of the essence to itself is absolutely necessary.

A Thomist scholar to whose two recently published books we shall turn in a few minutes has pointed out that the argumentation in Thomas' *de deo* becomes more affirmative when the *de deo trino* is reached. In my view, he gives the wrong reason for this. Nonetheless, relative to the old polemic, it is significant that the movement of the *Deus in se* is from negative to positive, and not contrariwise. The reason is not hard to understand. In the kind of Neoplatonic thinking which is Thomas', as we move from simplicity to real multiplicity, we come closer to human modes and the capacity of human reason both for what grace gives and the light of nature manifests.

III. Why present the Trinitarian culmination of Aquinas' theology as fundamental metaphysics transgressing the separation of nature and grace?

¹⁴ In agreement with the scholarship, Humbrecht is clear about this.

¹⁵ He is explicit that the divine simplicity is known only negatively.

¹⁶ See Stephen Gersh, "Dionysius' *On Divine Names* Revisited: A Structural Analysis," *Dionysius* 28 (2010): 77-96.

In a few minutes I shall give some of the reasons why the metaphysical logic of Aquinas' *Ipsium esse subsistens* is not treated in its integrity in either "Philosophy" or "Theology" departments or faculties. Unfortunately, this prevails in the Catholic academic world and in the so-called "secular" academe, largely dominated in the Anglophone world by secularised Calvinism, and, in the French and American world, now including a militantly secularising Quebec, by the necessities of *laïcité*.¹⁷ Hope comes from the presence of Classicists, whether in Philosophy departments or in Theology faculties, where such training was once almost universal.¹⁸

That theology belongs to Ancient and Medieval Philosophy cannot be doubted. It is after all, to mention nothing else, one of the names Aristotle gave the science also called wisdom, and the science of being as being, and which came many centuries after him to be designated as "metaphysics".¹⁹ Moreover, we do not need to wait for Philo or Iamblichus for this theology to include revelation as well as the activity of discursive rationality and intellectual intuition. The primary Greek theologians Homer and Hesiod²⁰ are clear about their dependence on divine inspiration. Parmenides, in founding the logic of being, is equally explicit, and both Plato and Aristotle are clear that humans can possess the knowledge which belongs properly to the divine because it is not jealous but rather wants humans to participate in its intellectual beatitude. Nonetheless, once theology becomes Trinitarian, most will think of looking for it to be separated out from the university in the ecclesiastical seminary.

Theology as metaphysics, which always remained the fundamental logic of what is and what is not, of the known and the unknown, in the union and difference of εἶναι and νοεῖν, has a more or less continuous tradition in Greek and Latin texts from Parmenides to Nicholas of Cusa. The Renaissance Platonists

¹⁷ See generally *Changing our Mind on Secularization. The Contemporary Debate about Secular and Sacred in Judaism, Christianity and Islam*, Proceedings of the 29th Annual Atlantic Theological Conference Charlottetown, June 23rd to 26th 2009, edited Wayne J. Hankey and Nicholas Hatt (Charlottetown: St Peter Publications, 2010).

¹⁸ See my "Memoria, Intellectus, Voluntas: the Augustinian Centre of Robert Crouse's Scholarly Work," *Dionysius* 30 (2012): 41–76.

¹⁹ See my "Natural Theology in the Patristic Period," *Oxford Handbook of Natural Theology*, edited Russell Re Manning (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 38–56 at 38–43; Luc Brisson, "Un si long Anonymat," *La métaphysique: son histoire, sa critique, ses enjeux*, éd. L. Langlois et J.-M. Narbonne, Collection Zétésis (Paris/Québec: Vrin/Presses de l'Université Laval, 1999), 37–60 at 38–40; for Aquinas' use of the names of Aristotle's highest science see my "Why Philosophy Abides for Aquinas," *The Heythrop Journal*, 42:3 (2001): 329–348 at 341–345 where I also consider Jean-Luc Marion on the subject. His paper in *La métaphysique: son histoire, sa critique, ses enjeux* is of considerable importance.

²⁰ As Herodotus designates them.

start here, as well as from the texts of Plato. Aquinas, in the questions we shall consider, draws on almost the whole history before him. Certainly, his theology depends on Aristotle and the Greek, Latin, and Arabic Peripatetics, and, despite his almost complete ignorance of Plato's writings, on the Middle and Neo Platonists, who wrote in Greek, Latin or Arabic. Both the Aristotelian and Platonic traditions and their inner penetration, Hellenic, Christian, Jewish and Islamic, are essential to understanding his sources and his modifications of them. I appeal to Classicists as well as to philosophers, theologians, and students of religion to take responsibility for this tradition, something English-speaking Classicists have been working at more seriously than we once did.²¹

Understanding the Trinitarian culmination of Aquinas' theology as fundamental metaphysics, in the way Aquinas does, will not, to my knowledge, be generally found in "Philosophy" departments, or in seminaries among the theologians. It falls to the duty and especial *métier* of those who look at texts in their integrity.

One of the many joys, and the great advantage, of treating works like the *Summa theologiae* of Thomas Aquinas as a Classicist is not having to choose between whether it is a work of philosophy, revealed theology, or of spirituality, as an *itinerarium mentis in deum*.²² In fact, it, and almost everything like it before it, from Parmenides "The Way of Truth" and Aristotle's *Metaphysics*, through Philo's *De Opificio*, Origen's *De Principiis*, Plotinus' treatises, Augustine's *De Trinitate*, Proclus' *Elements of Theology* and his *Platonic Theology*, Eriugena's *Periphyseon*, to Bonaventure's *Itinerarium mentis in deum* are all three, often with treatments of literary hermeneutics as well. In the *sillage* of al-Ghazali and Moses Maimonides, Thomas' *Summa theologiae* will make the distinction between philosophical and revealed theologies which leads to the kind of division of genres we make currently. Nonetheless, the unity of philosophy, revelation and spirituality remains true both in it and for much after it. The *Summa theologiae* keeps all three together in a continuous movement within one work.

The *Deus in se* of the *Summa theologiae* has a compelling, logic, evolving in step by step modifications, from its beginning in Question 2 "On the Existence of God to its completion in Question Forty-three "On the Sending of the Divine Persons". Indeed, that logic continues into the questions on creation, and thus into the *Summa* as a whole. Creation, in a series of contrasts with the Divine in itself, is represented as the result of a productive operation, that of power, which, unlike knowing and willing, works outside the essence, as a procession or

²¹ On Dodds' role in this turn see my "Re-evaluating E.R. Dodds' Platonism," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 103 (2007): 499–541.

²² See my "'Knowing As We are Known' in *Confessions* 10 and Other Philosophical, Augustinian and Christian Obedience to the Delphic *Gnothi Seauton* from Socrates to Modernity," *Augustinian Studies* 34:1 (2003): 23–48 at 41–48 and Bradley, "Reading Thomas as a Theologian": 185ff.

emanation of the Trinitarian subsistences in their essential unity. Unlike the internal operations, that of power is neither according to nature nor necessity. It constitutes a relation with the opposition of giving and receiving, but, in contrast to the Trinity, the terms are unequal. Thus, the relation is not mutually of the relative terms but in the recipient.

There are two gatherings, breaks and transitions within the *de deo*, but there is a strong impulse throughout, and the structure, when reduced to its elements, is stunningly simple. A consequence of this simple logic uniting the whole is that the mystical *anagoge*, or *mystagoge*, begins with the rise towards cause in the *Quinque viae*, and the contemplation of the structure of *ipsum esse subsistens* implicitly and ever more explicitly trinitarian. For those considering the foundations of mystical experience in Aquinas, it is not only important that the culmination of the whole *de deo* is in the sending of the hypostatic giving and receiving of knowing and loving but also that the two gatherings, breaks and transitions within the treatise essentially involve the human subjective moment. Thus, the first of these, the questions on knowing and naming God begin with that on how God is “a nobis cognoscitur”, because, writes Aquinas, after the consideration “qualiter Deus sit secundum seipsum” the question is “qualiter sit in cognitione nostra”.²³ Even more striking from this point of view is the question concluding the whole *de deo uno*, *On the Divine Happiness*, which is objectively the *summum bonum* but is also a good participated by the creature.²⁴ The Divine Beatitude concludes by gathering:

... the ‘de divina beatitudine’ involves a return to the point of departure which contains what intervenes. Happiness is a perfection which collects rather than removes. This is made clear by the first words of the first article; according to Boethius, happiness is ‘status omnium bonorum aggregatione perfectus’. ... Specifically, happiness is presented as an intellectual activity containing will and power, rather than as a less complete relation to the object than they. Happiness knows the good it possesses—or, put otherwise, it is by knowledge that will enjoys its self-possession as its own end or good. Further, the intellectual nature, which is happy, is, as will, the source of good or evil, and has power over its acts. Intellect is the origin of will and power—this was already clear—and they are also, thus, the perfections of intellect. So, as a self-complete activity, intellect contains them and is happy. Beatitude is intellect knowing and enjoying its will and power, the happiness of God, and synthetically

²³ *Summa theologiae* 1.12, title and prologue.

²⁴ *Summa theologiae* 1.26.3 ad 1: *in genere bonorum participabilium a creatura*.

completes the divine operations. Beatitude also involves the subjective relation to God explicit in questions 12 and 13, i.e. the relation of rational creatures to God. Partly God is recognized to be happy 'secundum intellectum', because it is by intellect that we enjoy God in vision. He is our blessedness. Objectively, he alone is happy since other intellects are happy by knowing him. Returning to the solutions in question 12, Thomas is able to place happiness in the subjective act of finite intellects through created grace. The whole *de deo uno* is then concluded by showing that God's happiness includes all happiness. So, as God's unity gathers into his simplicity all those positive perfections which its initially privative form seemed to deny, happiness gathers into his knowledge all the perfections of his creatures: "quidquid est desirabile in quacumque beatitudine, vel vera vel falsa, totum eminentius in divina beatitudine praeexistit" (*ST* 1.26.4).²⁵

IV. What breaks up this metaphysical logic?

Thierry-Dominique Humbrecht's two recent books treating the *Deus in se* and Aquinas' *Summa theologiae* exhibit the institutional structures, the historical traditions, and the philosophical and theological aims and positions which separate the *de deo uno* from the *de deo trino* in a way the *Summa theologiae* does not do. These prevent seeing their unifying logic.

Théologie négative et noms divins chez saint Thomas d'Aquin (Paris: Vrin, 2005), 841 pages, treats what belongs to the beginning questions of *de deo uno* the *Summa theologiae*. It publishes a dissertation directed by Olivier Boulnois, Directeur d'études at the École Pratique des Hautes Études, and Professeur at the Institut catholique de Paris. He was a student of and is now a collaborator with Professeur Jean-Luc Marion. Gilles Emery, O.P., Jean-Luc Marion, Remy Brague, Ruedi Imbach, and Alain de Libera were on the jury. *Théologie négative* earned Humbrecht a doctorate in philosophy from the secular École Pratique des Hautes Études in Paris.

It was succeeded by *Trinité et création au prisme de la voie négative chez saint Thomas d'Aquin*, Bibliothèque de la Revue thomiste (Paris: Parole et Silence, 2011); 788 pages devoted to the matter of the *de deo trino* and the initial questions concerning creation. *Trinité et création* was written as Fr Humbrecht's dissertation for the canonical doctorate in theology at the Dominican University of Fribourg in Switzerland. It was supervised there by Gilles Emery, O.P., Ordinary Professor of Dogmatic Theology at Fribourg, with François-Xavier Putallas, and Serge-Thomas Bonino, O.P. (of the Toulouse convent which publishes the *Revue*

²⁵ *God in Himself*, 112-113.

thomiste), on the jury, among other notable philosophical – theological scholars of St Thomas.

Evidently it is of striking importance that what Aquinas united in one work, more than once, and what he set out by a continuous step by step argument in the *Summa theologiae*, is divided now between two disciplines, carried on in two very different, indeed, in some sense opposed, universities. Such disciplinary and institutional division is common in Western Christendom, indeed, almost universal. It is important that neither in *Théologie négative* nor in *Trinité et création* does Humbrecht work through the logic structuring Thomas' questions. About this, and the reasons for it, something must be said.

I have already indicated that Aquinas himself made the distinction between what is known by the light of natural reason and what is known by a gracious addition to that which will work itself out over time in the kind of separations we see with Humbrecht's books.²⁶ This distinction was new in Latin Christendom and was opposed by Aquinas's so-called "Augustinian" contemporaries. The Franciscans were fiercely against it. They led in the condemnations of the 1270s and of 1284 which were consequences of the separation of philosophy from revealed theology to which Aquinas ascribed, even if he was not, at least at first, the object of the condemnations, and even if there were more extreme separations and positions than his. One of the problems devilling the study of Aquinas is that we tend to read the authoritative position he came to have in the Catholic Church back into the High Middle Ages. Then he was a radical on the edge; some of his positions were implicated in the condemned propositions and approaches. The Franciscans not only carried off the palm in the period, but there is considerable truth in Gilson's position that during most of Thomism's history, Aquinas was interpreted through a Franciscan, Duns Scotus.²⁷ Be that as it may, the *Summa theologiae* unites what Aquinas identifies as the two lights of our knowledge.²⁸

More important, ultimately, is the coming into being of the university in Latin world in the 12th and 13th centuries and the creation and separation within it of the Faculties of Arts, the home ground of philosophy, and of Theology.

²⁶ On which see my "Aquinas at the Origins of Secular Humanism? Sources and innovation in *Summa Theologiae* 1.1.1," *Nova et Vetera* [The English Edition of the International Theological Journal], 5:1 (2007): 17–40.

²⁷ On this, with references to the crucial literature, see my "Self and Cosmos in Becoming Deiform: Neoplatonic Paradigms for Reform by Self-Knowledge from Augustine to Aquinas," *Reforming the Church Before Modernity: Patterns, Problems and Approaches*, edited Christopher M. Bellitto and Louis I. Hamilton (Aldershot, England/ Burlington, VT.: Ashgate Press, 2005), Chapter 3, 39–60 at 42–46.

²⁸ *Summa theologiae*, 1.1.1ad2.

Although the university did not, and probably could not have, developed in the Latin world without what it derived from the Arabic revival, mediation, and development of Greek philosophy, the Faculty of Arts gave it an institutional home it did not have in the Islamic world. The Arts *magistri* saved philosophy in the way it was carried on in the Western extreme of that world by Averroes and his like.²⁹ Philosophy and philosophers in the Faculty of Arts in Paris and elsewhere were subservient to theology and the theologians, according to the image and structure created by Aristotle of a queen and her handmaidens, picked up by Philo and normal in the 13th century.³⁰ However, throughout that century, with real success despite real danger from the authorities, philosophy asserted its substantiality as a way of life, and the Arts *magistri* maintained the propriety of having institutional autonomy and norms of their own.³¹ The *magistri* were abetted, in accord with the implacable irony governing conflict, by the theologians who opposed them. Aquinas was properly a member of the Faculty of Theology and he certainly struggled against what he named, and helped to create, as “Latin Averroists,” like Siger of Brabant, on Straw Street.³² However, crucially, he transgressed both the philosophy – revealed theology, and the Arts – Theology faculty, boundaries in several ways, most notably by doing philosophy in the manner of the Arts *magistri* and according to their norms. Thus Aquinas helps philosophy’s growing autonomy in the 13th century

²⁹ See, on the difference between Eastern and Western in Islam, Ibn Tufayl’s *Hayy Ibn Yaqzan*.

³⁰ See Robert D. Crouse, “St. Thomas, St. Albert, Aristotle: *Philosophia Ancilla Theologiae*,” *Atti del Congresso Internazionale Tommaso nel suo settimo centenario*, i (Naples: Edizioni Domenicane Italiane, 1975), 181–185; idem, “*Philosophia Ancilla Theologiae*: Some texts from Aristotle’s *Metaphysica* in the Interpretation of Albertus Magnus,” *Actas del V Congreso Internacional de Filosofía Medieval*, 2 vols (Madrid: Editora Nacional, 1979) i, 657–661.

³¹ See Bradley, “Reading Thomas as a Theologian”: 189–197.

³² There is an extensive literature, crucial parts of which are treated in my unpublished “Aquinas’ New Aristotle and the Platonists: *Plotinus unus de magnis...inter commentatores de Aristotilis* (Aquinas, *De unitate intellectus contra Averroistas*),” A lecture for the Medieval Institute of the University of Notre Dame, Background Paper. Essential are R.-A. Gauthier (ed) in Aquinas, *De Unitate Intellectus contra Averroistas*, ed. Fratrum Praedicatorum, Commissio Leonina: vol. 43 (Rome 1976), 249–250 and in Aquinas, *Sententia libri de Anima*, ed. Fratrum Praedicatorum, Commissio Leonina, vol. 45, pars 1 (Commissio Leonina / Vrin: Rome / Paris, 1984), introduction; F.-X. Putallaz and R. Imbach, *Profession philosophe: Siger de Brabant*, Initiations au Moyen Âge (Paris: Cerf, 1997); Alain de Libera, *Raison et Foi: Archéologie d’une crise d’Albert le Grand à Jean-Paul II*, L’ordre philosophique (Paris: Seuil, 2003); B. Carlos Bazán, “Siger of Brabant,” *A Companion to Philosophy in the Middle Ages*, ed. Jorge J.E. Gracia and Timothy B. Noone, Blackwell Companions to Philosophy (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003), 632–642. Fundamentals of Gauthier’s framework so far as they depend on hypotheses as to what Averroes’ thought and how it was understood by Latins in the 13th-century are now undermined by Richard Taylor in Averroes (Ibn Rushd) of Cordoba, *Long Commentary on the De Anima of Aristotle* (New Haven/ London: Yale, 2010), xcvi–cv

both by opposing it (or at least some practice of it) and by working according to its proper methods and norms as these were developed in the Faculty of Arts. He did this primarily by way of commentaries on Aristotle and the *Liber de causis*, astonishingly undertaken not as a preparatory work at the beginning of his labours but during the last years of his teaching and writing. Indeed, while he was working on the *Summa theologiae*, left unfinished, and later, he made his philosophical expositions and treatises important both for the interpretation of Aristotle and for his own philosophical and theological arguments.³³ So, with Aquinas, we have distinctions contained in that out of which they were divided, an institutional separation transgressed, a subordination overcome by the recognition of the integrity of nature, metaphysics and revelation united.

What happened to produce what we see in Humbrecht's two books? Several things: philosophical, doctrinal and institutional, indeed, we may say, political. Certainly a metaphysics grounded not in *esse* but in common being, provided the basis for an onto-theological structure which subordinated the divine to comprehended being. There is huge controversy as to when this occurred. Many from Gilson through Marion with their followers, blame this, which they designate as the metaphysical structure characteristic of modernity, and, thus, modernity itself, on Duns Scotus, but this is contested. Probably we must wait for the 18th century and Christian Wolff for the elements to coalesce in this way.³⁴ Nonetheless, it is generally agreed that Thomistic scholasticism became a form of shallow rationalism.³⁵ Doctrinally, corresponding to this was the notion of "pure nature" conceived as the complete correlative of grace; the idea was fathered on Augustine and Aquinas as the Eden, so to speak, in which to construct philosophical proofs of Catholic dogmas, independent of revelation. Certainly one of the most important scholarly works in respect to Aquinas in the 20th century was Henri de Lubac's demonstration that "pure nature" was opposed to

³³ See my "Why Philosophy Abides for Aquinas," idem, "Thomas' Neoplatonic Histories: His following of Simplicius," *Dionysius* 20 (2002): 153–178, idem, "Philosophy as Way of Life for Christians? Iamblichan and Porphyrian Reflections on Religion, Virtue, and Philosophy in Thomas Aquinas," *Laval Théologique et Philosophique* 59:2 [Le Néoplatonisme] (Juin 2003): 193–224, and idem, "Participatio divini luminis, Aquinas' doctrine of the Agent Intellect: Our Capacity for Contemplation," *Dionysius* 22 (2004): 149–78.

³⁴ See Richard Cross, "Duns Scotus and Suarez at the Origins of Modernity," *Deconstructing Radical Orthodoxy: Postmodern Theology, Rhetoric and Truth*, edited Wayne J. Hankey and Douglas Hedley (Aldershot, England: Ashgate Press, 2005), Chapter 5, 65–80.

³⁵ See the judgements of Josef Pieper, "the customary interpretation of St Thomas has been considerably determined by Rationalist thought" (*The Silence of St Thomas*) and Joseph Owens ("Value and Person in Aquinas" *Atti del Congresso Internazionale Tommaso d'Aquino nel suo settimo centenario*, 9 vol., vii [Napoli, 1978], 57) as quoted in my "Making Theology Practical": 91–92 and see my *One Hundred Years*, 131–146.

the teaching of both these great authorities and was also pernicious.³⁶ De Lubac wrote:

[W]ishing to protect the supernatural from any contamination, people had in fact exiled it altogether...leaving the field free to be taken over by secularism....Christians...seek to find a harmony with things based on an idea of nature which might be acceptable to a deist or an atheist. The last word in Christian progress and the entry into adulthood would then appear to consist in a total secularization which would expel God not merely from the life of society, but from culture and even from personal relationships.³⁷

Then, there was a crucial development, beginning at the latest in the 17th century, whereby speculative theology of the kind undertaken by Aquinas was replaced with “positive theology” directly at the service of the pastoral work of the ecclesiastical authorities. “It was based not on logical precision but rather on harmonizing the sources of the ecclesiastical tradition of the first six centuries: Fathers, Councils and Synods, ancient liturgies.”³⁸ Theology is not in the university, nor founded an understanding of the nature of what is, but in the seminary, and is founded in what is necessary to the priests of the church: “Theology in respect to its substance has regard to what is necessary to the Church and her Priests (*Theologia secundum suam substantiam spectata est Ecclesiae eiusque Sacerdotibus necessaria.*)”³⁹ Significantly, Humbrecht maintains that the *de*

³⁶ See his *Surnaturel. Études historiques*, nouvelle édition avec la traduction intégrale des citations latines et grecques by Michel Sales, Théologie (Paris: Desclée de Brouwer, 1991) and my *One Hundred Years*, 142–151, idem, “‘Dionysius dixit, Lex divinitatis est ultima per media reducere’: Aquinas, hierocracy and the ‘augustinisme politique,’” in *Tommaso D’Aquino: proposte nuove di lettura. Festschrift Antonio Tognolo*, edited Ilario Tolomio, *Medioevo. Rivista di Storia della Filosofia Medievale*, 18 (Padova: Editrice Antenore, 1992), 119–150 at 130–133, idem, “From St Augustine and St Denys to Olier and Bérulle’s Spiritual Revolution: Patristic and Seventeenth-Century Foundations of the Relations between Church and State in Québec,” *Laval Théologique et Philosophique* 63:3 (octobre 2007): 515–559 at 525 and John Milbank, *The Suspended Middle: Henri de Lubac and the Debate concerning the Supernatural* (Grand Rapids/Cambridge: Eerdmans, 2005).

³⁷ de Lubac, *The Mystery of the Supernatural*, trans. Rosemary Sheed (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1967), xxxv.

³⁸ B. Neveu, “French Theology and the Gallican Culture, on the Shelves of the Library of the University of King’s College, Halifax, Nova Scotia,” Public Lecture in celebration of the Bicentennial of the Library of the University of King’s College delivered October 4, 1989, *Épilogue/Épilogue: Canadian Bulletin for the History of Books, Libraries, and Archives*, 10 (Fall/Automne, 1990): 1–16 at 5–6.

³⁹ My “From St Augustine and St Denys”: 526, quoting *Compendiosae Institutiones Theologicae ad Usus Seminarii Pictaviensis*, issu et auctoritate illustrissimi ac reverentissimi Dom. D. Joannis-

deo trino is kataphatic because here Aquinas is writing to serve ecclesiastical authority and, for Humbrecht, this affirmation of doctrinal language founds our knowledge of the divine names. I shall speak of this reversal again in a few moments, but I must note here how foreign this procedure would be to the risk taking Aristotelian radical whose positions would have been seen as among those condemned in 1277 and 1284 had he not by a good providence, like Eckhart later, died opportunely.⁴⁰ And I say nothing here of the thoroughly and consistently systematic character of Thomas' mind. Of course, part of the same kind of church theology taught the doctrine of pure nature; thus, both distortions of what Aquinas practiced and taught were passed on together. They prevailed and were even more authoritatively universalised with the neo-Thomistic revival inaugurated in the 19th century, especially under Pope Leo XIII; it crushed, without annihilating, all other theology in the Catholic Church until the Second Vatican Council.

Two questions arise which have the same answer. What made Thomism so attractive to the Catholic Church? And why did it absorb so much that was alien to it? The answer can be expressed briefly, even if its working out was the labour of multitudes over centuries. On the political side, the humiliating failure of the ultimate assertion of the church's *potestas directa* by Boniface VIII in *Unam Sanctam* (November 18, 1302) made itself felt. The rise of secular power had its correlate, and often its support, in philosophical science carried on in the mode of the Averroist Aristotelianism of the Arts *Magistri*, i.e. with a sense of the autonomy, completeness, and internal finality of philosophy. There has been no permanent reversal of these since the 13th century and, indeed, as seen in figures like Dante and Emperor Frederick II, *Stupor Mundi*, what the translations from Arabic brought exceeded argument and structure in the university and entered the political.⁴¹ The Church was forced to adapt. The Papacy, and its perceptive partisans, from the 14th century to Pope John Paul II in the 21st saw in Aquinas' use of a subordinated Aristotle a medium by which the Catholic Church could engage the secular and justify, politically, a *potestas indirecta*.⁴² It made no

Claudii de la Poype de Vertrieu, Pictaviensis Episcopi, 5 tomes duodecimo (Poitiers: J. Faucon, 1729), i, Quest. 6, Resp. 1, 9.

⁴⁰ See my "Self and Cosmos", 43–44.

⁴¹ See Ruedi Imbach, *Dante, la philosophie et les laïcs*, Initiations à la philosophie médiévale (Paris-Fribourg: Cerf-Éditions Universitaires Fribourg, 1996).

⁴² See my "Pope Leo's Purposes and St. Thomas' Platonism," *Atti dell' VIII Congresso Tomistico Internazionale*, 8 vol., ed. A. Piolanti, viii, Studi Tomistici 17 (Città del Vaticano: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1982), 39–52, idem, "Making Theology Practical", idem, "'Dionysius dixit'", idem, "Dionysian Hierarchy in St. Thomas Aquinas: Tradition and Transformation," *Denys l'Aréopagite et sa postérité en Orient et en Occident, Actes du Colloque International Paris, 21-24 septembre 1994*, édités Ysabel de Andia, Collection des Études Augustiniennes, Série Antiquité 151 (Paris: Institut

difference that Thomas' own position was Dionysian in the manner of Boniface VIII and that his system was as much Platonist as Aristotelian. When used by institutions philosophers lose the right to have their teaching represented truthfully.

By this route we come back to the two books of Fr Humbrecht. Philosophically they are determined by the anti-metaphysical, anti-idealist, and anti-Neoplatonic existential Thomism of Gilson, deeply modified by the far more sophisticated understanding of Heidegger by Jean-Luc Marion who sees himself in the *sillage* of Lévinas and of an anti-Neoplatonic Dionysius. It is this which accounts for Humbrecht's refusal to follow the logic of the divine names in the *Summa theologiae*; it is unmistakably, as he admits, that of a modified Proclean Neoplatonism. Equally, Humbrecht must keep the *de deo uno* apart from the *de deo trino*, lest metaphysics do more than lead us to the Church's authoritative teaching of what is graciously revealed. Metaphysics may play a very limited role as propaedeutic, but it must have no substantial content and must never determine what belongs to faith. This understanding of philosophy and its role, and of the nature of theology, force Humbrecht to contradict without evidence the scholarly consensus on Aquinas' relation to Dionysius.⁴³

As I indicated, Humbrecht's most novel assertion is that "Retroactively, the Trinity as a theological *corpus*, confers on the divine names an indispensable solidity".⁴⁴ For Humbrecht, because, following Proclus, and in accord with the *Liber de Causis*, Dionysius privileges a superessential Trinity, Aquinas "discretely quits" him. The reason: "to save the appropriateness of our discourse about God".⁴⁵ The purpose of this salvage is in turn that "Thomas Aquinas wishes to make himself the servant of the [church] councils"; in particular he is moved by his desire to serve the purposes of Lateran IV.⁴⁶ Not a shred of evidence is offered for this astonishing reversal. In my view, it has against it the radical daring of Thomas in his fidelity to the integrity of philosophical reasoning, while

d'Études Augustiniennes, 1997), 405–438, idem, "Philosophy as Way of Life for Christians?", idem, "Self and Cosmos in Becoming Deiform", idem, "Aquinas at the Origins of Secular Humanism?".

⁴³ See most concisely, V. Boland, *Ideas in God According to Saint Thomas Aquinas. Sources and Synthesis*, Brill Studies in the History of Christian Thought 69 (Leiden: 1996), 310: "Dionysius must be interpreted always as a Catholic believer ... In Saint Thomas' commentary on the *Liber de causis* 'the faith' tells against Proclus and against 'platonic positions', against the 'Auctor', against Aristotle, but never against Dionysius who remains for Saint Thomas an authoritative source for what the faith teaches."

⁴⁴ *Trinité et création au prisme de la voie négative chez saint Thomas d'Aquin*, Bibliothèque de la Revue thomiste (Paris: Parole et Silence, 2011), 726.

⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 727.

⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 728.s

he limits it vis-à-vis what faith alone can know, thus creating a new structure for Christian theology, his courageous defiance of the “Augustinian” Franciscans with ecclesiastical power on their side, and his determination in the *Summa theologiae* to at last present sacred doctrine in the right order. To that we now turn.

V. A Map of the Logic of *Ipsium Esse Subsistens*, the *Deus in Se* of the *Summa theologiae*

See Powerpoint presentation

January 7, 2014