

AQUINAS AND MAIMONIDES ON THE POSSIBILITY OF THE
KNOWLEDGE OF GOD

AN EXAMINATION OF THE *QUAESTIO DE ATTRIBUTIS*

Amsterdam Studies in Jewish Thought

Editor:

Reinier Munk, *Leiden University and Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam,
The Netherlands*

Editorial Board:

Resianne Fontaine, *University of Amsterdam, The Netherlands*

Robert Gibbs, *University of Toronto, Canada*

Warren Zev Harvey, *The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Israel*

Albert van der Heide, *Vrije Universiteit, Amsterdam, The Netherlands*

Arthur Hyman, *Yeshiva University, New York, U.S.A.*

Howard Kreisel, *Ben Gurion University of the Negev, Beer Sheva, Israel*

David Novak, *University of Toronto, Canada*

Kenneth Seeskin, *North Western University, Illinois, U.S.A.*

Colette Sirat, *Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS), France*

VOLUME 11

The titles published in this series are listed at the end of this volume.

AQUINAS AND MAIMONIDES
ON THE POSSIBILITY OF
THE KNOWLEDGE OF GOD

AN EXAMINATION OF THE
QUAESTIO DE ATTRIBUTIS

by

Mercedes Rubio

 Springer

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

ISBN-10 1-4020-4720-7 (HB)
ISBN-13 978-1-4020-4720-6 (HB)
ISBN-10 1-4020-4747-9 (e-book)
ISBN-13 978-1-4020-4747-3 (e-book)

Published by Springer,
P.O. Box 17, 3300 AA Dordrecht, The Netherlands.

www.springer.com

Printed on acid-free paper

All Rights Reserved

© 2006 Springer

No part of the material protected by this copyright notice may be reproduced or
utilized in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical,
including photocopying, recording or by any information storage and
retrieval system, without written permission from the copyright owner.

Printed in the Netherlands.

CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Purpose	1
The Texts	9
Acknowledgements	13
 Chapter One. The Dispute on the Divine Attributes	 15
1. Chronology of <i>In I Sent., d. 2, q. 1, a. 3</i>	16
2. The Reasons for the Dispute	28
(a) Aquinas' <i>In I Sent., d. 2, q. 1</i>	28
(b) Tarantasia's Commentary and Aquinas' <i>Responsio de 108 articulis</i>	34
3. Aquinas' Revision of <i>In I Sent., d. 2, q. 1</i>	44
(a) Aquinas' <i>In I Sent., d. 2, q. 1, a. 3</i> (<i>Quaestio de attributis</i>)	45
(b) The Roman Commentary on the Sentences	55
4. Maimonides' Place in the Dispute	63
 Chapter Two. Aquinas and Maimonides on the Divine Names	 65
1. Maimonides' Position According to the <i>Commentary on the Sentences</i> and <i>De Potentia</i>	66
(a) "Being" as the Proper Name of God	67
(b) The Multiplicity of the Divine Names	73
2. Maimonides' Position According to the <i>Quaestio de attributis</i>	89
(a) The Multiplicity of the Divine Names	89
(b) "Being" as the Proper Name of God	110
3. Maimonides' Position According to <i>S. Theologiae I, q. 13</i>	123
 Chapter Three. The <i>Quaestio de Attributis</i> and <i>Zechariah 14, 9</i>	 127
1. The Apprehension of the Divine Essence	128
(a) <i>Zechariah 14, 9</i> in the <i>Guide of the Perplexed</i>	128
(b) <i>Zechariah 14, 9</i> in the Works of Aquinas	133
2. The Stages of the Intellect	140
(a) Aquinas' Distinction "in via/in patria"	140
(b) Maimonides' Distinction "In this world/ In the next"	151

Chapter Four. The <i>Quaestio de Attributis</i> and the Limits of Natural Knowledge	161
1. The Five Causes That Prevent the Instruction of the Multitude	162
(a) The Five Causes in <i>The Guide of the Perplexed</i>	162
(b) The Five Causes in Aquinas' Works	169
2. Maimonides and Aquinas on the Role of Faith and Prophecy	193
Chapter Five. The Knowledge of the Existence of God	210
1. The Philosophical Questions That Have No Answer	211
(a) Maimonides' <i>Guide II, 17</i>	212
(b) <i>Guide II, 17</i> in the Works of Aquinas	214
2. The Knowledge of the Existence of God	218
(a) Maimonides' Method for Demonstrating the Existence of God	219
(b) Aquinas' Method for Demonstrating the Existence of God	227
(c) Maimonides' Place in Aquinas' Five Ways	238
Conclusions	245
Appendix I. Chronology of the Works of T. Aquinas Examined	249
Appendix II. <i>Quaestio de attributis</i> . Text with English Translation	250
Appendix III. Critical editions of <i>Dux Neutorum I, 33</i> (<i>Guide I, 34</i>) <i>Dux Neutorum II, 1</i> (<i>Guide II, Intro.</i>) <i>Dux Neutorum II, 2</i> (<i>Guide II, 1</i>) <i>Dux Neutorum II, 17</i> (<i>Guide II, 18</i>)	266
Bibliography	307
Index	318

INTRODUCTION

Purpose

Moses Maimonides' *Guide of the Perplexed* is pervaded by a permanent tension regarding the possibility and extent of the knowledge of God by a created intellect, which lies at the roots of the 13th century controversy over Maimonides' writings. While Maimonides asserts that "its purpose is to give indications to a religious man for whom the validity of our Law has become established in his soul and has become actual in his belief,"¹ one of its early opponents, Meshullam ben Solomon, writes referring to him: "Those who deny the proper attributes of God speak out until faith has been drained out of man."² He will instead claim to be "determined to know the God of my fathers and my thoughts are continuously of Him".³ Meshullam understands that despite Maimonides' interest in preserving his readers' faith, he leads them to skepticism by denying the possibility of any positive knowledge of the essence of God.

There is a basic agreement among scholars regarding the difficulty of correctly interpreting the *Guide*, since he acknowledges that he intends to expound the truth about the matters pertaining to divine science in an obscure and disordered manner. He himself provides some reasons for this method, such as the fact that he wishes "that the truths be glimpsed and then again be concealed, so as not to oppose that divine purpose ... which has concealed from the vulgar among the people those truths especially requisite for His apprehension."⁴ At other times, alternatively, the cause of these apparent contradictions is due to the necessary steps that a teacher follows in order to make the disciple understand difficult or complicated matters.⁵ This is, in his

¹ *The Guide of the Perplexed*, ed. S. Pines, 5.

² Cf. H. Brody, "Poems of Meshullam b. Solomon Da Pierra", 113, No. 48, v. 9.

³ *Ibid.* 55, No. 24, v. 49.

⁴ *Guide*, 6-7.

⁵ *Ibid.* Intro., 17-18.

opinion, the reason for the divergences occurring in the books of the philosophers, “or rather of those who know the truth”.⁶ Actually, it can be assumed that Maimonides considers the *Guide* a philosophic work only in a restricted sense, because he asserts that the *Guide* is composed for “one who has philosophized and has knowledge of the true sciences, but believes at the same time in the matters pertaining to the Law”.⁷ As a consequence, when Maimonides writes about natural sciences, metaphysics, or cosmology, the reader should not think that he intends only to investigate the true reality of that particular philosophic notion:

For these notions have been expounded in many books, and the correctness of most of them has been demonstrated. I only intend to mention matters, the understanding of which may elucidate some difficulty of the Law.⁸

Maimonides defines this passage as “a preface which is like a lamp illuminating the hidden features of the whole of this Treatise, both of those of its chapters that come before and of those that come after”. He further explains: “My purpose in this Treatise ... is only to elucidate the difficult points of the Law and to make manifest the true realities of its hidden meanings, which the multitude cannot be made to understand because of these matters being too high for it.” Therefore, philosophical training is a requirement for understanding the *Guide* but not its goal. The *Guide* does not offer exhaustive explanation of the philosophical answers reported. The reader must figure them out by himself or herself, trying to fill in the blanks. In some places, Maimonides refers to himself as giving only the “chapter headings” of the difficult matters.⁹

Maimonides’ complex method inspired diverse and sometimes contradictory interpretations throughout the centuries.¹⁰

⁶ *Ibid.* 19.

⁷ *Ibid.* 9-10.

⁸ *Ibid.* II, Intro., 253-254.

⁹ E.g. I, Intro., 6, and I, 35, 81; cf. T.B. Hagigah 13a.

¹⁰ On the character of the *Guide* as a philosophic work, cf. L. Strauss, “The Literary Character of the Guide of the Perplexed”. Cf. also J.A. Buijs, “The Philosophical Character of Maimonides’ Guide — A Critique of Strauss’ Interpretation”. W.Z. Harvey reviews and reinterprets this discussion in “Why Maimonides was Not a Mutakallim”. Cf. also A. Ravitzky, “The Secrets of the *Guide to the Perplexed*: Between the Thirteen and Twentieth Centuries”, 165-177.

More recently scholars have suggested that Maimonides had severe doubts about the legitimacy of Metaphysics¹¹ and about the validity of the intellectual faculty for the knowledge of God.¹² In any case, the purpose of explaining the difficult points of the Law by means of a partial explanation of philosophical doctrines should be taken into account when trying to attribute any given doctrine to Maimonides; it makes the study of his interpreters and scholars who use the *Guide* an essential part of Maimonidean studies.¹³

In this context, Thomas Aquinas receives particular attention as one of the outstanding 13th century Latin scholars who shows sustained interest in the contribution of Maimonides to the philosophical discussions of his time.¹⁴ The large number of quotations of the *Guide* in his works witness this interest and have been repeatedly surveyed. Studies in this field developed a two-way search, attempting to understand both the contribution of Maimonides to Aquinas' thought and the latter's interpretation of Maimonides' position. In general, scholars agree in considering the problem of the knowledge of God the common interest of both philosophers, their point of agreement being the proofs for the existence of God and the issue of the divine attributes, the core of their disagreement.¹⁵

¹¹ S. Pines stressed the puzzling consequences of Maimonides' position, which in his opinion leads to the impossibility of any knowledge of God and to maintaining two opposite metaphysical systems. Cf. "The Limitations of Human Knowledge According to Al-Fārābī, Ibn Bājja, and Maimonides".

¹² W.Z. Harvey points to Maimonides' version of the proofs for the existence of God as an example of his mistrust in the rational capacity of man. Cf. "Maimonides' First Commandment, Physics, and Doubt". Cf. also *Physics and Metaphysics in Hasdai Crescas*, 59.

¹³ A. Ravitzky, op. cit.; also, "Samuel Ibn Tibbon and the Esoteric Character of the Guide of the Perplexed".

¹⁴ W.Z. Harvey, for example, notes that Aquinas follows Maimonides (and Averroes), and not Avicenna, in his own version of the Avicennian proof as his Third Way. Cf. *Physics and Metaphysics*, 76.

¹⁵ For instance, E. Gilson notes Thomas Aquinas' success in achieving a synthesis with elements that were already found in the thought of Maimonides in a rather inconsistent way. Cf. *The Christian Philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas*. W.Z. Harvey stresses the central role of Aquinas in assimilating the Aristotelian philosophy into his own Latin tradition. Cf. "Maimonides and Aquinas on Interpreting the Bible", 76. A. Wohlman extensively analyzes the agreements

The brevity and partialness of most of Aquinas' references to Maimonides, and the fact that they are scattered in works composed under different circumstances and motivations, makes a comprehensive view difficult. As S. Feldman puts it:

When we turn to Thomas Aquinas we encounter several difficulties, textual and philosophical; for the various passages where Thomas discusses Maimonides' theory of attributes are not internally consistent, or at least not entirely similar. Each text therefore deserves separate treatment.¹⁶

Research in this field has so far suggested that Aquinas had a progressive understanding of the position of Maimonides. This would mean that the earlier texts need to be read in light of the later ones and that the references have dissimilar value depending on their chronology. In this context, H. Wolfson attempts an explanation for the different versions of Aquinas' interpretation of Maimonides' doctrine of the divine attributes based on the chronology of his works:

In his *Commentary on the Sentences* (I Sent. d. 2, q. 1, a. 3, ad 3), written between 1254-1256, St. Thomas mentions both Avicenna and Maimonides as using the negative and the causative interpretations of attributes, and under each of these interpretations he gives two forms of the interpretation, which we shall designate as Form I and Form II and this Form II can be shown to reflect more closely the interpretations used by Maimonides. In *De Potentia* (q. 7, a. 5), written between 1265-1267, he mentions only Maimonides as using these two methods of interpretations and under each one of these two interpretations he gives only what corresponds to Form II in his *Commentary on the Sentences*, thus indicating that when he mentions only Maimonides as the user of these two methods of interpretation he ascribes to him only Form II. Now in *Summa Theologica* I, c. 13, which part was written between 1266-1268, practically during the same time as *De Potentia*, for the negative interpretation he gives Form II, which in *De Potentia* he ascribes to Maimonides, whereas for the causative interpretation he gives Form I, which in *De Potentia* he does not ascribe to

and disagreements between them. Cf. *Thomas d'Aquin et Maïmonide, un dialogue exemplaire*, and *Maïmonide et Thomas d'Aquin, un dialogue impossible*. D. Burrell compares the conceptions of both philosophers on the divine nature. Cf. *On Knowing the Unknowable God*. I. Dobbs-Weinstein focuses on the limits of reason in the two philosophers from an ethical perspective. Cf. *Maimonides and St. Thomas Aquinas on the Limits of Reason*.

¹⁶ S. Feldman, "A Scholastic Misinterpretation of Maimonides' Doctrine of Divine Attributes", 32.

Maimonides. This, then, is the reason why here in the *Summa*, the negative interpretation is ascribed to Maimonides, whereas the causative interpretation is not ascribed by him to Maimonides.¹⁷

N.A. Stubbens accepts Wolfson's chronological solution for the differences between the texts and thus disqualifies the earliest reference of the *Commentary on the Sentences*:

A causal interpretation of divine predicates is attributed to Maimonides in the *Commentary on the Sentences* (I Sent., d. 2, q. 1, a. 3). There, Aquinas reports Maimonides as saying God is said to be good because he produces goodness in his creatures. ... If an argument from silence could be made, we would conclude that Aquinas recognized his mistake since in his later works Aquinas did not attribute this view to Maimonides, to the best of my knowledge.¹⁸

Feldman reproduces Wolfson's conclusions regarding the differences between the texts in the *Commentary on the Sentences* and in the *Summa Theologiae* and Aquinas' alleged misinterpretation of the position of Maimonides in the earlier passage. However, he notes that it is nevertheless an interesting passage.¹⁹

Against this solution, studies unrelated to Maimonides have argued that the article in question did not exist in the original text of the *Commentary on the Sentences*, but was added around 1265-1266, which makes it contemporary with *De Potentia* and Part I of the *Summa Theologiae*.²⁰ Therefore, the theory of a contradiction between these texts should be discarded. This study intends to show that, contrary to what has been suggested so far, *In I Sent.*, d. 2, q. 1, a. 3 contains Aquinas' final reading of the *Guide* on the issue and his most complete interpretation of the possibility of the knowledge of God according to Maimonides, with elements that are absent from Aquinas' earlier references to him. The reconstruction of the historical circumstances surrounding the composition of this article shows that Aquinas assigned exceptional importance to it, and reveals the background of Aquinas' renewed interest in Maimonides' position on

¹⁷ H. Wolfson, "St. Thomas on Divine Attributes", 28.

¹⁸ N.A. Stubbens, "Naming God: Moses Maimonides and Thomas Aquinas", 233.

¹⁹ Cf. Feldman, *op. cit.*, 34.

²⁰ Particularly the studies of A. and H.-F. Dondaine, B.M. Lemaigre, L.E. Boyle, and J.F. Boyle, which are reviewed in Chapter 1, 1.

the knowledge of God. The analysis of the text and its references to other places unveil Aquinas' comprehensive approach to the *Guide* and the place of this work in his thought. Moreover, it reveals the role of faith as a — thus far — unknown aspect of the contribution of the *Guide* to Aquinas' doctrine on the attributes, and the reasons behind Aquinas' failure to mention Maimonides' name when introducing his Ways for the knowledge of the existence of God.

This systematic examination of the texts has led to a fresh reading of the dialogue between Aquinas and Maimonides.

In the context of a study of this nature, between two scholars the first of whom died some twenty years before the second was born, some remarks regarding the methodology are necessary. A work of research in the form of a dialogue must find its place while avoiding two possible extremes. On the one hand, one may be tempted to consider all of Aquinas' references to Maimonides bluntly either as “borrowed material” to elucidate an issue if the reference is successfully incorporated into his own organic teaching, or as one of the “positions rejected” in order to introduce Aquinas' own answer to the matter. This is what we could call the work of the historian. On the other hand, one finds their discourse on the different philosophical matters so close and parallel that there may be an inclination to compose an imaginary dialogue, regardless of an existing interaction between the texts.

Be that as it may, no one has ever questioned the fruitfulness of investigating Aquinas' interests in the authorities found in his writings. My point of departure has been to define the criteria for the selection of the texts that could avoid these two extremes. First, I have discarded texts on the different issues in each author in which I could not find an external textual or historical reference to the other, even if they were doctrinally relevant. Second, I have discarded, or relegated to the category of “supportive material”, references too restricted in content that could only provide a “borrowed material” or “position rejected” type quotation. Third, finding a fresh presentation of Aquinas' insight into Maimonides in the *Quaestio de attributis*, I have chosen to focus on the period of its redaction and prior to it, realizing that, by pulling that thread, it was possible to follow a lesser-known path than that of previous studies. My feeling is that the period

immediately after the *Quaestio* — marked by the redaction of the *Summa Theologiae* — has offered so much illumination to scholars, that it has somewhat obscured the preceding one, in which Aquinas' dialogue with Maimonides is still in the making and offers more explicit insights into the *Guide*.²¹

One of the aims of the present study is that of bringing to light texts in Aquinas' works that have received little scholarly attention and which contain excellent material for a comprehensive understanding of his position. The *Summa Theologiae* and the *Summa contra Gentiles* provide — as their name indicates — a summary of Aquinas' position in the different issues. In this respect, the *Quaestio* provides references that contain, in addition to the same references to Maimonides as *S. Theol.* I, q. 13 and *De Potentia*, q. 7, a. 2, Aquinas' fully developed explanation of Maimonides' position and his answer to him. We may say, in Maimonidean fashion, that these texts are the “chapter headings” for the full-length explanations that we find in the *Quaestio* and its related texts. And it is understandable that this may be so, since Aquinas composed *De Potentia* contemporary to the *Quaestio* and the *Summa* immediately after, and there would have been little point in repeating what he had just written.

The choice of this alternative reading of Maimonides leads to a shift from the attention traditionally paid to the role of analogy in Aquinas' answer to Maimonides' position on the knowledge of God. Aquinas had already developed his doctrine of analogy at the earliest stage of his academic life, and he probably saw it by that time as an answer to Maimonides' solution. This doctrine is found for the first time in *In I Sent.*, d. 2, q. 1, a. 2., the article preceding the *Quaestio*. The present study supports the view that what provoked Aquinas' review of Maimonides' position on the knowledge of God was not a renewed concern for Maimonides' controversial answer to the problem, but a

²¹ J.-P. Torrell pointed to the fact that Aquinas' earlier works are more explicit and helpful for understanding his position on the issue than later ones. Cf. “La vision de Dieu per essentiam selon Thomas d'Aquin”, p. 49 : Pour autant que j'aie pu m'en rendre compte, il n'y a pas d'évolution sensible en passant d'une oeuvre à l'autre, mais il arrive que les oeuvres antérieures soient plus explicites que les oeuvres plus tardives, de sorte qu'elles sont aussi plus éclairantes pour un premier contact. Cela se vérifie particulièrement pour sa théorie générale de la connaissance de Dieu.

much closer concern, that is, the need to criticize and at the same time justify his colleague Peter of Tarantasia's writings on the matter. It also shows that Aquinas' review of Maimonides' *Guide* at this critical stage led him not in the direction of an enhancing of the role of analogy — the notion is paid little attention in the *Quaestio* — but in that of searching for a comprehensive explanation of why our knowledge of God is so scarce in this life, and the hints we find for a future, clear knowledge of God in the world to come.

Moreover, the *Quaestio* successfully links Aquinas' interest in the *Guide* with his interest in the doctrine of the beatific vision, something that could not be perceived in other texts. Finally, the existing scholarly consensus — voiced by Gilson and supported by Wohlman —²² regarding Maimonides' role in shaping Aquinas' doctrine on the most proper name of God is somewhat modified after an examination of the Latin translation of the *Guide*, which confuses “being” and “existence” in several places, shows that Aquinas could not have known Maimonides' real position on this matter.

The importance of honoring the transcendence of God above the world emerges at the background of this dialogue between Maimonides and Aquinas.²³ The present study contributes to the key articulation found in Aquinas' writings, which is central in the *Quaestio*, distinguishing between the levels of reality, thought and language. Thomas develops an epistemology that successfully safeguards the divine transcendence while preserving also the possibility of a human knowledge of God in this world in Aristotle's distinction of the meanings or manners of being. The meanings of being provide also the basis for the Thomistic doctrine of the degrees of being and for the doctrine of participation, securing a causal relation Creator-creatures that safeguards God's transcendence and His ontological priority, while providing logical and ontological grounds for a language about God.

²² Cf. A. Wohlman, *Thomas d'Aquin et Maïmonide, un dialogue exemplaire*.

²³ Some authors, like D. Burrell, have reinterpreted this transcendence in terms of a “distinction” between God and the world. Although some of Maimonides' explanations may, if taken to their logical consequences, open the way for such a conclusion, I do not believe that he really intended to go that far, as other places of the *Guide* acknowledge the possibility of certain knowledge of God. I have definitely found no grounds for this notion in the works of Aquinas.

At the epistemological level this priority is reflected in the naming of created perfections after divine ones, and this epistemological relation secures the knowledge of God by linking the created world with its transcendental Cause. Although Maimonides affirms the existence of a causal relation, Aquinas reveals in the *Quaestio* that his way of stating it inverts the natural causal order. Maimonides' ontology reverts on his epistemology, in which the subject who knows is the one who has the priority for verifying the truth of the proposition instead of placing it on the reality named. In Aquinas' view, Maimonides' discourse about God is that about God's existence and the nature of such discourse is modal, with a mingling of the ontological and logical levels.

Summarizing, I shall defend here three points: the centrality of the issue of the divine attributes in Aquinas' interest in the *Guide*, the importance of *In I Sent.*, d. 2, q. 1, a. 3 (*Quaestio de attributis*) for understanding Aquinas' reading of the *Guide* on the issue of the knowledge of God, and the place of the *Guide* in Aquinas' explanation of the role of faith and in his Five Ways for the existence of God.

The Texts

The texts relevant for this study are the totality of Aquinas' references to Maimonides on the knowledge of God, explicit and implicit, and the related passages in the *Guide*. Their evaluation demands taking into account both their location and their quality.

Regarding the references' locations it is worth noting that the scholar inquiring about Aquinas' position regarding any issue or author has to cope with a huge number of works, many of them not easily available, or not yet published in reliable editions. The Collected Works of Thomas Aquinas amount to some 8,700,000 words. Two of his best-known works, the *Summa Theologiae* and the *Summa contra Gentiles*, represent less than a quarter of the total. There have been 14 attempts to edit the whole of the *Corpus Thomisticus*, but none of them has so far succeeded.²⁴ The selection

²⁴ Cf. E. Alarcón, "Una cuestión de método. Consideraciones previas a la interpretación de Santo Tomás de Aquino", 388. A list of the most reliable editions of every work of the entire *Corpus* is available in his Doctoral Dissertation, *Evolución léxica y cronología del Corpus Tomista*, 15-27.

of all the texts relevant to the issue of the knowledge of God demanded a solution only provided by the publication of the *Index Thomisticus* in CD-ROM. This edition contains the entire *Corpus Thomisticus* — up to 118 works — plus some other contemporary or related pieces and allows exhaustive search by forms and *lemmae*.²⁵ I rely on the chronological table of the *Corpus* given by E. Alarcón for the ordering of the texts.²⁶

Regarding their quality, it should be taken into account that quotation guidelines for scholars in the 13th century are less strict than today's. Sources are often used without explicit reference. Sometimes the book is not available and the writer quotes it from memory. This limitation frequently leads to inaccuracy in the interpretation, as the role of the source is mostly to provide a useful idea for the argumentation. Moreover, the usage of the time dictates avoiding quoting by name any living author, for that inserts him into the Tradition as an *auctoritas* even if the quotation is meant to oppose his views.²⁷ In this respect, Aquinas is one of the most accurate citers of authorities. The editors of the critical edition of the works of Aquinas devoted a whole volume to listing his references to authors and writings in the *Summa Theologiae* and the *Summa contra Gentiles*. In these two works, he quotes Aristotle 4130 times, St. Augustine 3179 times, Averroes 81 times, and Maimonides 21 times.²⁸ Aquinas usually provides a new and original interpretation of the source that contributes in a significant way to expressing his own position and supplies a direct or indirect critique and analysis of the position of the author quoted. He also adheres strictly to the rules and avoids quoting by name any contemporary author. This does not apply to Maimonides, however, because Aquinas was born some two decades after he died and could therefore quote him *nominatim*. His name appears 78 times in the entire *Corpus*

²⁵ *Thomae Aquinatis Opera omnia cum hypertextibus in CD-ROM auctore Roberto Busa S.J.*

²⁶ Cf. *Evolución léxica*, 377-379. A brief catalogue of Aquinas' works can be found in J.A. Weisheipl, *Friar Thomas D'Aquino. His Life, Thought, and Work*.

²⁷ For instance, Aquinas does not mention one single time the name of Albert the Great, his teacher and one of the authors who most shaped his thought.

²⁸ Cf. *Sancti Thomae Aquinatis Opera omnia. Indices auctoritatum et rerum occurrentium in Summa Theologiae et Summa contra gentiles*, vol. XVI, 177-227.

Thomisticus.²⁹ Sometimes Aquinas simply refers to Maimonides as an authority supporting his view. On other occasions he judges Maimonides' position insufficient or even wrong, but he always takes him into account as a relevant source.

The central text of this study is the so-called *Quaestio de attributis* (*In I Sent.*, d. 2, q. 1, a. 3). I have also used relevant quotations from other works concerning the knowledge of the essence of God and the knowledge of God through faith to complete Aquinas position. Aquinas does not mention Maimonides in the context of the Five Ways for the existence of God. However, scholars have seen an influence of Maimonides' proofs in *Guide*, II, Intro. and c. 1 on Aquinas' two versions of the Ways in the *Summa Theologiae* and in the *Summa contra Gentiles*, and therefore they will also be brought into the discourse. Other texts are reviewed for their connection with these ones.³⁰ Since the chronology of Aquinas' works plays a central role in this research, I provide in Appendix I a list of the ones relevant to this study with their years of composition. Appendix II makes available the complete Latin text of the *Quaestio* with my English translation.

The references to Maimonides in the works of Aquinas on other issues will not be reviewed in this study. They represent most of the matters treated in the *Guide*, like the number of spiritual substances (souls and angels), the matter of the heavenly spheres, and divine providence in the world.³¹ Others are related to the interpretation of biblical language,³² the precepts of the Law of

²⁹ Five times in *In I Sent.*, 11 times in *In II Sent.*, 4 times in *In III Sent.*, 7 times in *In IV Sent.*; 3 in the *Summa contra Gentiles* (one in each of the 3 first books); 8 times in the *Prima Pars* of the *Summa Theologiae*, 10 in the *Prima Secundae*, 10 times in *De Veritate*, 11 in *De Potentia*; twice in the *Quaestiones Disputatae de Anima*; and once in: *In librum Boethii de Trinitate*, *In Symbolum Apostolorum*, *In Psalmos*, *In Threnos Hieremiae*, and *De Spiritualibus Creaturis*. Twice Aquinas wrote his name and then crossed out the paragraph, cf. *Thomae Aquinatis Opera omnia, Autographi deleta*.

³⁰ I have made a complete survey of Aquinas' works through the IT, but have added to the Bibliography of Sources only the ones quoted in footnotes.

³¹ Cf *In I Sent.*, d. 35, q. 1, a. 2, Resp.; d. 39, q. 2, a. 2; *In II Sent.*, d. 1, q. 1, a. 5, ad 6; d. 2, q. 2, a. 3; d. 3, q. 1, a. 1; a. 3; *In III Sent.*, d. 12, q. 2, a. 1, ad 4; *In IV Sent.*, d. 48, q. 2, a. 3, ad 6; *De Pot.* q. 5, a. 7, arg. 17; q. 6, a. 7, Resp.; *De Veritate* q. 5, a. 9, sc 5; ad 4; *Summa Theol.* I^a, q. 22, a. 2; ad 5; q. 50, a. 3; *De Spiritualibus Creaturis*, a. 8, arg. 16; *Q. Disp. De Anima*, a. 3, arg. 6; C.G. II, c. 92; III, c. 97; *In Threnos Hier.* 3, 13.

³² *In II Sent.*, d. 14, q. 1, a. 1; ad 2; a. 2, ad 2; a. 5; *Summa Theol.* I^a, q. 66, a. 1, ad 5; q. 68, q. 1, ad 1; q. 69, a. 1, ad 5; q. 74, a. 3, ad 3; ad 4; *Q. Disp. De Anima*, a. 8, ad 19; *In Psalmos*, 18; *De Pot.*, q. 4, a. 1, ad 2; ad 5; ad 15.

Moses,³³ and prophecy.³⁴ Maimonides' name is usually found in the frame of a group of relevant authorities, whose answers Aquinas collates. Regarding philosophical matters whose explanation is difficult, Maimonides' position is accepted or rejected according to its level of correspondence with that of the authorized Christian interpreter that seems most likely to Aquinas.

To the best of my knowledge, from all of Maimonides' works Aquinas knew only *The Guide* and therefore all the quotations examined here are from this work, unless otherwise noted.

Maimonides' *Guide of the Perplexed* or *Dalālat al-Hā'irīn* was written in Arabic in Cairo in the 1190s. It was translated twice into Hebrew as *Moreh ha-Nebukhim*. Samuel Ibn Tibbon composed a literal translation in c.1204, the year of Maimonides' death. A less literal but more literary translation was made shortly after by Judah Al-Ḥarizi. Both translations were done in Provence. The Latin translation known to Aquinas, *Dux neutrorum*, seems to have been made originally from the Al-Ḥarizi translation in the first half of the 1200s, with later corrections based on the Arabic original and Ibn Tibbon. I provide in Appendix III a summary of the previous research on the origins of *Dux neutrorum* and a critical edition of *Dux I*, 33 (*Guide I*, 34), *Dux II*, Incipit and c.2 (*Guide II*, Intro. and 1), and *Dux II*, 18 (*Guide II*, 17) with an examination of the genesis of the text through a collation with the two Hebrew translations and the Arabic original.

All translations from Latin texts are mine. The quotations of the *Guide* meant to present Maimonides' original position are from S. Pines' English translation, modified occasionally in order to preserve uniformity of terminology and on the basis of the Arabic text, whereas those in footnotes used to show Aquinas' reading of the *Guide* are from my edition of *Dux neutrorum* from three Latin manuscripts: Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, Ms. Lat. 15973, Paris, Bibliothèque de l'Université 601 (both from the 13th century), and Saint Omer, Bibliothèque publique 608 (14th century). To facilitate collation of the Latin text I also provide references to the 16th century edition of *Dux neutrorum*, which usually coincides with the chapter numeration in mss. B and C (E does not have

³³ *In III Sent.*, d. 37, q. 1, a. 5, sc 2; Resp.; *In IV Sent.*, d. 1, q. 2, a. 3; a. 5; d. 33, q. 1, a. 3, ad 3; d. 40, q. 1, a. 4, Resp.; d. 42, q. 2, a. 2, Resp.; d. 48, q. 2, a. 3, ad 6; *Summa Theol.* I^a-II^{ae}, q. 101, a. 1, arg. 4; a. 3, ad 3; q. 102, a. 3, ad 4; ad 6; ad 11; a. 4, ad 2; a. 5, ad 4; a. 6, ad 1; ad 8; q. 105, a. 2, ad 12.

³⁴ *In IV Sent.*, d. 49, q. 2, a. 7, ad 2; *De Veritate* q. 12, a. 2, arg. 6; ad 6; a. 5, Resp.; a. 12, arg. 6; ad 6.

chapter numbering). The reader will notice that the *Dux* has a different chapter division than Pines' edition.

Acknowledgments

The list of people to whom I owe thanks for their help through the various phases of this research is long and I apologize for being able to mention only a few of them due to editorial reasons.

This book is the result of several years of research in the field of theory of knowledge in Medieval philosophy, to which I was first introduced at the University of Navarra (Spain), where I presented my MA dissertation on the knowledge of God according to Albert the Great, in 1993 (later published in the Series *Cuadernos de Anuario Filosófico*). This early interest led me to The Hebrew University of Jerusalem (Israel), where I initiated a long process of "immersion" in the Jewish and Arabic sources of Latin theory of knowledge. This itinerary was completed in 2001 with the presentation of a dissertation for the degree of Ph.D. under the guidance of Prof. Zeev W. Harvey — the substance of that research is contained in the present volume. My heartfelt thanks to him, for his support throughout the sometimes difficult procedure of getting acquainted with a whole new world, that of Jewish thought in general and Maimonidean studies in particular.

I also wish to thank Prof. Enrique Alarcón, from the University of Navarra, for his remarks on the chronological and doctrinal development of Aquinas' thought and his guidance on related issues, which contributed greatly to the completion of this study.

The members of the jury from the Hebrew University that evaluated the dissertation contributed too with their suggestions. My sincere acknowledgment to Prof. Marcel Dubois, Dr. Caterina Rigo, and Prof. Avital Wohlman for their comments.

Among all the people who encouraged me to pursue studies in Medieval philosophy I would like to thank particularly Profs. Alejandro Llano and Angel Luis González, my advisors during my years at the University of Navarra, Prof. Arthur Hyman from Yeshiva University (New York), whom I met briefly during a Congress in Erfurt, and the late Fr. Leonard E. Boyle, from the Vatican Library, who taught me to read Latin manuscripts.

I wish to mention and thank here the Memorial Foundation for Jewish Culture (New York), the Institute for Jewish Studies of The Hebrew University of Jerusalem, the Luxembourg Fund, and the

Nissalowitz Family Fund, for their generous support during my years as a doctoral student. I am grateful to the Shlomo Pines Society for awarding me the Shlomo Pines Prize for this research in 2002.

My acknowledgments also to the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Bibliothèque Nationale de France, Bibliothèque de la Sorbonne, Bibliothèque de Saint-Omer, Cambridge University Library, Bodleian Library in Oxford, and the Jewish National and University Library in Jerusalem for their assistance in the location and reproduction of manuscripts. I am grateful to Dr. S. Vanning for proof-reading the final version of this work and checking my English translation of the Latin texts.

Key of Abbreviations

a.	articulus
arg.	argumentum
Compendium Theol.	Compendium Theologiae
d.	distinctio
De 108 articulis	Responsio de 108 articulis
De Pot.	Quaestiones disputatae de potentia
De Trinitate	Super Boetium de Trinitate
De Ver.	Quaestiones disputatae de veritate
Dux	Dux neutrorum seu dubiorum
fol.	folium
Guide	The Guide of the Perplexed
In [] Sent.	Commentum in librum [] Sententiarum Petri Lombardi
IT	Index Thomisticus
l.	line
ll.	lines
q.	quaestio
Quaestio	Quaestio de attributis
Resp.	Respondeo, Responsio
Roman C.	Roman Commentary on the Sentences
Sc.	sed contra
SCG	Summa contra Gentiles
Sol.	Solutio
S. Theol.	Summa Theologiae
Super ad Eph.	Reportatio super epistolam ad Ephesios
Super ad Rom.	Commentarium super epistolam ad Romanos
T.B.	Talmud Bavli