

Outline of Compendium of Theology by Thomas Aquinas

1. Scope of the Present Work

1. Sin has caused man to fall
 - a. God has restored man to glory by becoming one of us
2. Knowledge necessary for salvation
 - a. knowledge necessary for salvation is contained within a few brief articles
 - i. from Christ's prayer: love is the fulfilling of the law
 - ii. from the Apostle Paul: faith, hope, and charity
3. This document
 - a. this document will treat first of faith, then of hope, then of charity
 - b. [NOTE: Aquinas died before he completed the sections on hope and charity]

2. Arrangement of Topics Concerning Faith

1. The Christian faith consists of two primary doctrines
 - a. The Divine Trinity
 - b. The Humanity of Christ
2. The first section of this document will look at the Divine Trinity
 - a. The Existence of God
 - b. The Trinity
 - c. Creation

Part I: The Existence of God

3. The Existence of a Prime Mover

1. Some things are activated by other things
 - a. Example: tree growth is activated by Sunlight, Sunlight is activated by the activities of the Sun, which is activated by gravity, which is activated by mass
2. If an object is activated by another thing, then that other thing is itself either A) activated by something else or B) already active without needing to be activated
 - a. If B, then something exists that is already active
 - b. If A, then there is a third object that activates it, and so on
3. Circular explanations are impossible
 - a. if activated activators require explanation, then postulating an activated activator is part of the set needing explanation, and therefore explains nothing
4. Therefore, there must exist something already active that doesn't need to be activated by anything else: a prime mover

4. The Prime Mover is Unchangeable

1. The Prime Mover cannot change itself

- a. If the Prime Mover was changeable, it would be changed either by itself or by something else
- b. It can't be changed by something else
 - i. Because it is the Prime Mover at the root of all other causes
- c. It can't change itself
 - i. If it changes itself, it is either changed by itself as a whole, or one part of it changes causes change in another part
 - ii. It cannot change itself as a whole
 - 1. To cause a change is to cause an object to gain a property it didn't have
 - 2. To be a cause is to have
- d. Therefore, the Prime Mover is unchangeable

2. Cause of all change

- a. The Prime Mover is the root of all other causes and therefore all change
- b. Explanations cannot be circular
- c. So the Prime Mover cannot itself be a changeable thing

5. The Prime Mover is Eternal

- 1. A beginning or ending to an object's existence is a change
- 2. The Prime Mover is unchangeable (from 4)
- 3. Therefore, the Prime Mover is eternal

6. The Prime Mover Necessarily Exists

- 1. Whatever is incapable of non-existence exists necessarily rather than contingently
- 2. The Prime Mover is eternal (from 5)
- 3. Therefore the Prime Mover exists necessarily rather than contingently

- 1. Any object that has a possibility of existing or not existing needs something else to make it exist
 - a. Because the object itself is indifferent with regard to either alternative
- 2. There is nothing prior to the Prime Mover
- 3. Therefore, it is impossible for the Prime Mover to be or not be
- 4. There, the Prime Mover necessarily exists

7. The Prime Mover is Everlasting

To reiterate, the Prime Mover must be everlasting because:

- 1. Whatever exists necessarily must always exist
- 2. The Prime Mover exists necessarily (from 6)

1. Beginning or ceasing to exist is a change
 2. The Prime Mover is unchangeable (from 4)
-
1. Whatever begins to exist has a prior cause
 2. The Prime Mover has no prior cause (from 3)

8. The Prime Mover lacks Temporal Succession

1. Temporal succession is only found in objects subject to change
 - a. An object subject to temporal succession can have something accrued or lost to it, such as age
2. The Prime Mover is unchangeable (from 4)
3. Therefore, the entire existence of the Prime Mover is simultaneous

9. The Prime Mover is Non-Composite

1. Parts exist prior to the whole of which they are a part
2. There is nothing prior to the Prime Mover (from 3)
3. Therefore, the Prime Mover is non-composite

10. The Prime Mover is its own Archetype

1. An object is its own archetype if it has no individuating properties
2. The Prime Mover is non-composite (from 9)
3. Therefore, the Prime Mover is not a composite of both archetypal properties and individuating properties
4. Therefore, the Prime Mover is its own archetype

11. The Prime Mover's Archetype is Existence

1. There is no distinction between elements in the Prime Mover (from 9)
2. Therefore, there is no distinction between what the Prime Mover is and whether it exists
3. Therefore the Prime Mover is existence

12. The Prime Mover is not a Member of a Genus

1. A species is identified as a difference added to genus
2. The Prime Mover is non-composite (from 9)
3. Therefore the Prime Mover is not a composite of genus and species-specific properties
4. Therefore the Prime Mover is not a member of a genus

13. The Prime Mover is not a Genus

1. An object's identity, but not its existence, comes from its genus
 - a. Example: the thing is established in its proper existence by specific differences
 2. The Prime Mover is existence itself (from 11)
 3. Therefore, the Prime Mover cannot be a genus
-
1. Each genus distinguished from other genres by some difference

2. No differences can be apprehended in existence itself
 - a. For differences do not share in genus except indirectly, so far as the species that are constituted by differences share in a genus.
 - b. But there cannot be any difference that does not share in existence, since non-being is not the specific difference of anything
3. The Prime Mover is existence itself (from 11)
4. Accordingly the Prime Mover cannot be a genus predicated of a number of species

14. The Prime Mover is not a Species with Members

1. What separates members of a species are non-archetypal features
 - a. Example: location in space, individual characteristics, etc.
 2. The Prime Mover is non-composite (from 9)
 3. Therefore, the Prime Mover is not composed of both archetypal features and non-archetypal features
 4. Therefore, the Prime Mover is not a species that is predicated of many individuals
-
1. A number of individuals comprised under one species differ in their existence, and yet are alike in their archetype
 2. Accordingly, whenever a number of individuals are under one species, their existence must be different from the archetype of the species
 3. But in the Prime Mover, existence and archetype are identical (from 11)
 4. Therefore God cannot be a sort of species predicated of many individuals

15. The Prime Mover is One

1. If there were many Prime Movers, they would be called by this name either equivocally or univocally
2. If they are called "Prime Mover" equivocally, further discussion is fruitless; there is nothing to prevent other peoples from applying the name "Prime Mover" to what we call a stone
3. If they are called "Prime Mover" univocally, they must agree either in genus or in species.
4. But we have just shown that the Prime Mover can be neither a genus nor a species comprising many individuals
5. Therefore, a multiplicity of Prime Movers is impossible

16. The Prime Mover is Immaterial

1. Matter is changeable
2. The Prime Mover is unchangeable (from 4)
3. Therefore, the Prime Mover is immaterial

17. The Prime Mover is not a Body

1. Bodies have parts
2. The Prime Mover does not have parts (from 9)
3. Therefore, the Prime Mover is not a body

1. A body cannot cause change in anything unless it too changes
2. The Prime Mover causes change but is unchangeable (from 3 and 4)
3. Therefore, the Prime Mover is not a body

18. The Prime Mover is Infinite

1. The simpler an object is, the more abundant it is
 2. The Prime Mover is the simplest thing there is (from 9)
 3. Therefore, the Prime Mover is unlimited in abundance
-
1. An object is limited by being material or by being a body
 2. The Prime Mover is immaterial and not a body (from 16 and 17)
 3. Therefore, the Prime Mover is not limited

19. The Prime Mover is All Powerful

An object is as causally active as its existence

The Prime Mover is unlimited in existence (from 18)

Therefore, the Prime Mover is infinitely causally active

20. The Prime Mover is Complete

1. What is incomplete derives from what is complete
 - a. Example: a child, the incomplete form of a human, derives from mature parents
2. Everything that exists derives from the Prime Mover (from 3)
3. Therefore the Prime Mover is complete

21. The Prime Mover contains all Effects

1. An effect must exist in the cause of that effect, either actually or virtually
 - a. Example: the cause of fire must itself be actually on fire, or have the chemical composition to cause fire
2. The Prime Mover is the cause at the root of all other things (from 3)
3. Therefore, all existing things must exist actually or virtually in the Prime Mover
4. Things cannot exist actually in the Prime Mover
 - a. The Prime Mover is immaterial and has no parts
5. Therefore, all things exist virtually in the Prime Mover

22. All Effects are Unified in the Prime Mover

1. All existing things and features exist in the Prime Mover (from 24)
2. The Prime Mover is non-composite (from 6)
3. Therefore, there is no distinction between things existing in the Prime Mover
4. Therefore, all things and features existing in the Prime Mover are unified

23. The Prime Mover Lacks all Non-Archetypal Features

- 1.

<p>23. The Prime Mover lacks all Non-Archetypal Features</p>	<p><u>Argument A</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All features are unified in the Prime Mover (from 22) 2. The Prime Mover is its own archetype (from 3. Therefore, all features of the Prime Mover are part of its archetype, and there are no non-archetypal features <p><u>Argument B</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Prime Mover is non-composite (from 6) 2. Therefore the Prime Mover is not composed of both archetypal and non-archetypal features <p><u>Argument C</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If a thing is complete, then nothing can be added to it 2. The Prime Mover is complete (from 23) 3. Therefore, nothing can be added to the Prime Mover 4. If a thing has a non-archetypal features then these are features added to it, over and above its archetypal features 5. Therefore, the Prime Mover has no non-archetypal features
<p>24. The Prime Mover's simplicity is not contradicted by the many names given to it</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Prime Mover is often given many names 2. We cannot know the Prime Mover directly since it is unobservable and infinite 3. We can only know the Prime Mover indirectly via its effects 4. We name the Prime Mover based on effects we see around us, which are multiple 5. All effects are unified in the Prime Mover (from 22) 6. Therefore, the multiple names we may give to the Prime Mover do not contradict its simplicity
<p>25. The names of the Prime Mover are not synonymous</p>	<p>In this connection three observations are in order. The first is that the various names applied to God are not synonymous, even though they signify what is in reality the same thing in God. In order to be synonymous, names must signify the same thing, and besides must stand for the same intellectual. conception. But when the same object is signified according to diverse aspects, that is, notions which the mind forms of that object, the names are not synonymous. For then the meaning is not quite the same, since names directly signify intellectual</p>

	<p>conceptions, which are likenesses of things. Therefore, since the various names predicated of God signify the various conceptions our mind forms of Him, they are not synonymous, even though they signify absolutely the same thing.</p>
<p>26. Impossibility of Defining the Prime Mover</p>	<p>A second point is this: since our intellect does not adequately grasp the divine essence in any of the conceptions which the names applied to God signify, the definitions of these terms cannot define what is in God. That is, any definition we might formulate of the divine wisdom would not be a definition of the divine power, and so on regarding other attributes.</p> <p>The same is clear for another reason. A definition is made up of genus and specific differences, for what is properly defined is the species. But we have shown that the divine essence is not included under any genus or species. Therefore it cannot be defined.</p>
<p>27. Analogy of terms predicated of the Prime Mover and other beings</p>	<p>The third point is that names applied to God and to other beings are not predicated either quite univocally or quite equivocally. They cannot be predicated univocally, because the definition of what is said of a creature is not a definition of what is said of God. Things predicated univocally must have the same definition.</p> <p>Nor are these names predicated in all respects equivocally. In the case of fortuitous equivocation, a name is attached to an object that has no relation to another object bearing the same name. Hence the reasoning in which we engage about one cannot be transferred to the other. But the names predicated of God and of other things are attributed to God according to some relation He has to those things; and in their case the mind ponders what the names signify. This is why we can transfer our reasoning about other things to God. Therefore such terms are not predicated altogether equivocally about God and about other things, as happens in fortuitous equivocation.</p>

	<p>Consequently they are predicated according to analogy, that is, according to their proportion to one thing. For, from the fact that we compare other things with God as their first origin, we attribute to God such names as signify perfections in other things. This clearly brings out the truth that, as regards the assigning of the names, such names are primarily predicated of creatures, inasmuch as the intellect that assigns the names ascends from creatures to God. But as regards the thing signified by the name, they are primarily predicated of God, from whom the perfections descend to other beings.</p>
<p>28. The Prime Mover has knowledge</p>	<p><u>Argument A</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. All features in the world pre-exist in the Prime Mover (From 21) 2. "Intelligence" is a feature in the world <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Example: humans have intelligence 3. Therefore, intelligence exists in the Prime Mover <p><u>Argument B</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Freedom from matter is the cause of intellect <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The intellect involves abstraction away from matter and material conditions b. Therefore, knowledge is an immaterial process 2. The Prime Mover is immaterial (from 16) 3. Therefore, the Prime Mover has intellect <p><u>Argument C</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Intelligent beings use instruments to affect non-intelligent things, but non-intelligent things do not use instruments to affect intelligent beings <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Example: a man uses a stick to move a rock, but rocks do not use sticks to move men 2. The Prime Mover uses "secondary causes" (instruments) to cause everything to occur (from 3) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Example: the Prime Mover keeps the Sun in existence, which causes the lake to exist; so the Sun is an instrumental or secondary cause of the lake 3. Therefore, the Prime Mover is intelligent

29. The Prime Mover's Intelligence is Complete	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. When reasoning from premise to conclusion, before one actually understands the conclusion one only potentially understands the conclusion 2. The Prime Mover does not have any potentials (from 3) 3. Therefore, the Prime Mover does not reason from premise to conclusion but already has complete knowledge
30. The Prime Mover understands primarily only itself	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. An object causes the intellect to understand it 2. The Prime Mover cannot be affected <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. The Prime Mover has no potentials (from 3) 3. Therefore, the Prime Mover understands primarily itself 4. If the Prime Mover understands other things, it understands them as participations in itself, rather than as distinct things in their own right
31. The Prime Mover is its own Intelligence	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Understanding only comes after intelligence 2. Therefore, something intelligent has the potential to understand, then <i>actually</i> understands 3. The Prime Mover does not have potentials (from 1) 4. Therefore, the Prime Mover's intelligence and understanding must be identical
32. The Prime Mover has Will	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. An intelligent being causes other things to occur via the will <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Example: a person rationally understands that sitting on the train track will result in being run over by a train, so then wills to move off the track 2. The Prime Mover is the cause of everything the occurs (from 3) 3. The Prime Mover has intellect (from 28) 4. Therefore, the Prime Mover has will
33. The Prime Mover's Will is its Intelligence	<p><u>Argument A</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A good that is apprehended by the intellect is the object of the will, it moves the will and is the will's act and perfection. 2. In the Prime Mover there is no distinction between mover and moved, act and potency, perfection and perfectible 3. The Prime Mover's intelligence and existence are identical 4. Therefore the will of the Prime Mover is not distinct from its intellect and its archetype

	<p><u>Argument B</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Among the various perfections of things, the chief are intellect and will <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. A sign of this is that they are found in the nobler beings 2. But the perfections of all things are one in the Prime Mover and also its archetype 3. In the Prime Mover, therefore, intellect and will are identical with its archetype
34. The Prime Mover's Will is its Willing	<p><u>Argument A</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Prime Mover's will is identical with the good willed by it 2. This would be impossible if its willing were not the same as its will <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. For willing is in the will because of the object willed. 3. Accordingly the Prime Mover's will is its willing. <p><u>Argument B</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Prime Mover's will is the same as its intellect and its archetype 2. But the Prime Mover's intellect is its act of understanding, and its archetype is existence 3. Therefore the Prime Mover's will must be its act of willing

36. The Foregoing Truths Embraced in the Christian Creed

So far we have established that there is a singular being which has intellect and will, as well as limitless power. The Greek word "theasthai" means "to see, to consider," and from this derives the word "theos," which is the Greek word for "god." Thus, in the Christian Creed we profess to believe in "one God, almighty."

37. The Philosophical Character of the Foregoing Truths

What we have seen so far is as far as the Greek philosophers went, for example, Aristotle and the "unmoved mover." However, the Christian religion makes further claims about God, such as that he is three persons in one. We now turn to an examination of this aspect of God.

38. God's Word in His Mind	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. God knows and understands Himself (from 30) 2. Whatever known is in the knower <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. A concept is in the mind of the person who knows it
-----------------------------------	--

	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Words are symbols of intellectual concepts Therefore, God's Word is in God
39. The Word as an "Offspring" of God	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The intellect is passive <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The intellect awaits the reception of information An object that can be known is active in relation to the intellect <ol style="list-style-type: none"> An object causes the passive intellect to form a conception of that object The conception of the object in the intellect is thus caused by both the intellect and the object known The passive principle is like a mother (awaiting impregnation) The active principle is like a father (causing the impregnation to occur) Therefore, something conceived in the intellect is like the offspring of the "mother" and "father"
40. God as Father of his Word	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> When an object is known, the object known is the "father," the intellect is the "mother", and the conception in the intellect is the "offspring" (from 39) However, when an intellect is aware of itself, the intellect is the active principle and hence the "father" Therefore, God is the "father" of his Word

41. Conception of the Word expressed in Christian Faith

Hence, in the Christian faith we profess belief in "God the Father, and in his Son," taking care to note that "son" means "intellectual conception," not "reproductive conception."

42. The Son has the same properties as the Father	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> In God, to exist and to understand are the same (from 30) The "son" is God's self-understanding (from 38) Therefore, the Son is equal to God, and so all attributes attribute to God are attributable to the Son
--	--

43. Son and Father equality expressed in Christian Faith

Hence, in the Christian faith we profess to believe that the Son is "of one substance with the Father." That is, they have the same properties.

44. The Word not distinct from the Father in Time, Species, or Archetype	

45. God in Himself as Beloved in Lover

A lover is moved by the beloved by an interior impulse

God loves himself

Therefore, God is in himself as beloved in lover

46. God's Love as Spirit

The beloved

47. God's Spirit as Holy

48. Love in God is not Accidental

49. Procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son

50. The Trinity of Divine Persons and Unity of Divine Essence

