# AQUINAS' ROMAN COMMENTARY ON PETER LOMBARD

JOHN F. BOYLE

The address presents the recently discovered second, Roman commentary of St. Thomas Aquinas on Peter Lombard's *Liber sententiarum* and offers some reflections on work to be done by scholars in the study of this text. The first part of the address presents the manuscript and its circumstances to argue for the authenticity of the text. The second part briefly describes the character and content of Thomas' *Lectura romana*. The third part addresses a concern expressed by Frs. Dondaine and Torrell that a rationalist tendency in the text's consideration of the Trinity raises questions of its authenticity.

*Keywords*: Thomas Aquinas, Lectura Romana, Works, Authenticity.

Tolomeo of Lucca, the student and biographer of Thomas Aquinas, reported that St. Thomas had commented on Book I of Peter Lombard's *Liber sententiarum* not once but twice: first, as a bachelor in Paris; second, as a master at Santa Sabina in Rome in the academic year 1265-1266. Tolomeo even says that he saw a manuscript of the lectures. Tolomeo is, however, alone in reporting Thomas' second commentary on Lombard, and in spite of his claim to have a seen a manuscript, no manuscript of this second commentary was known to exist.

I was a graduate student at the Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies in Toronto in 1982 when Fr. Leonard Boyle of the Order of Preachers delivered his Gilson Lecture, subsequently published as

*The Setting of the "Summa Theologiae" of Saint Thomas.*[1] In the course of the lecture, he announced the existence, at least in part, of Thomas' second Roman commentary on Book I of Peter Lombard's *Sentences*. This commentary was to be found in an Oxford manuscript, Lincoln College, Lat. 95. Fr. Hyacinthe Dondaine of the Leonine Commission had studied the manuscript and published some excerpts in an article in *Mediaeval Studies* entitled "'Alia lectura fratris Thome'?"[2] Fr. Dondaine raised the question: could this be the lost commentary? He concluded not. Fr. Boyle was fond of telling how he was walking from the Pontifical Institute library back to his office —he was half way across St. Joseph Street— when it dawned on him: Dondaine had it wrong. Fr. Boyle's modest remarks in *The Setting of the "Summa"* were followed by an essay in *Mediaeval Studies*, "'Alia lectura fratris Thome,'" this time without the question mark.[3] Fr. Boyle concluded that we have in Lincoln College, Lat. 95 at least some version of the second commentary as reported by Tolomeo of Lucca.

Shortly after the Gilson lecture, Fr. Boyle asked me to edit the commentary with him. I am happy to report that despite a number of setbacks, including the death of Fr. Boyle, the edition is finished and is currently being prepared for publication at the Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies.

---

1. L. E. BOYLE, *The Setting of the "Summa Theologiae" of Saint Thomas*, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, Toronto,1982; reprinted with revisions in L. E. BOYLE, *Facing History: A Different Thomas Aquinas*, Fédération Internationale des Instituts d'Études Médiévales, Louvain-la-Neuve, 2000, pp. 65-91.

2. H. F. DONDAINE, "'Alia lectura fratris Thome'? (Super 1 Sent.)," *Mediaeval Studies*, 42 (1980), pp. 308-336.

3. L. E. BOYLE, "'Alia lectura fratris Thome'," *Mediaeval Studies*, 45 (1983), pp. 418-429; reprinted in *Facing History*, cit. supra, pp. 93-106.

What do we find in Lincoln College, Lat. 95?[4] The primary text is Thomas' first commentary on Book I of Peter Lombard's *Sentences*, the Parisian *Scriptum*; it is written in an Italian hand of the late thirteenth century (hand A). A second commentary is found on the front and back fly-leaves and in the margins; it is written in a second Italian hand, also of the late thirteenth century (hand B). This marginal work consists of a prolog, ninety-seven articles, and three notes. The articles are to the prolog and to distinctions 1 through 17 and 23. The notes are to distinctions 3 and 24. We thus have another commentary on Lombard that has been very carefully copied into the margins of Thomas' Parisian *Scriptum*. What is this second commentary? Among the articles of distinction 2 which have been placed on the front fly-leaves we find this note: "These articles can be placed in distinction 2 of the first book secundum aliam lecturam fratris Thome." It was the "secundum aliam lecturam fratris Thome" that first caught Fr. Dondaine's attention. Hence the title of his essay: "'Alia lectura fratris Thome'?"

The circumstances of the manuscript are noteworthy. Fr. Dondaine reported a note of sale, only partially legible. Fr. Boyle was able to get a bit further. The manuscript appears to have belonged to a Dominican, Iacobus Raynucii. Iacobus was, for a few months, bishop of Florence, before his death in 1286. The manuscript, therefore, dates from before 1286. Iacobus was also Lector at Citta di Castello in 1273. If this were his first lectorship, then it would not be unreasonable to think that this Dominican of the Roman Province would himself have been a student of theology in Rome at Santa Sabina in academic year 1265-1266; that is, that he was himself one of the students in Thomas' classroom when the master lectured a second time on Lombard's *Sentences*. When Iacobus began his own teaching, this one time

4. A fuller description of the manuscript and the placement of the *Lectura romana* in it will be found in the introduction to the forthcoming critical edition [published as THOMAS DE AQUINO, *Lectura romana in primum Sententiarum Petri Lombardi*. Ed.: L. E. BOYLE; J. F. BOYLE, Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, Toronto, 2006].

student of Aquinas acquired a manuscript of Thomas' first commentary and then carefully had his own *reportatio* of the Roman *lectura* copied into its margins. Since the note of sale simply indicates Frater Iacobus, he likely sold it before being appointed Preacher General of the Order in 1281 and certainly before his episcopal appointment in 1286.[5] Thus, it is reasonable to think that the manuscript dates from before 1286; if this manuscript were acquired at the beginning of Iacobus' teaching, it could date from as early as 1273 (six years after St. Thomas' teaching of the *Lectura romana* at Santa Sabina).

Caution is in order: if the manuscript were sold before 1286, that would mean the Parisian *Scriptum* was sold before 1286. Do we have reason to think that the *Lectura romana* was already in the margin? If Frater Jacobus acquired the manuscript of the Parisian *Scriptum* as early as 1273, it was mostly likely new. If, furthermore, he acquired it, as Fr. Boyle suggests, with the purpose of comparing it to the *Lectura romana* which he already possessed, indeed, with the purpose of copying the *Lectura romana* into it, one would suppose that the *Lectura romana* would be one of the first texts in the margin. And so it is.

B writes without interruption throughout. When he writes, the blank pages at the front and back are just that, blank. There is no indication that he has had to move or adjust his copying to accommodate some antecedent text. In the sixty folios of the Parisian *Scriptum* shared by the *Lectura romana*, B only writes around A's self-correction in the margin. Not even a marginal "nota" is in his way. The manuscript was pristine when B undertook his work.

Let me note quickly another hand (or perhaps hands) of the late thirteenth century in the manuscript, which I call the Corrector. The Corrector corrects the Parisian *Scriptum*, most frequently by supplying missing words and phrases. Naturally, he

5. L. E. BOYLE, "Alia Lectura" cit., pp. 427-429. See E. PANELLA, "Iacopo di Ranuccio da Castelbuono OP: Testimone dell''Alia lectura fratris Thome'," *Memorie Domenicane* N. S., 19 (1988), pp. 369-385.

prefers to place his corrections beside the line to be corrected; when he can, he does. Sometimes, however, he cannot because B has gotten there before him. In such cases, the Corrector simply puts his correction in some blank spot, such as at the top of the page or, more tellingly, at the end of B's text or squished between A's Parisian *Scriptum* and B's *Lectura romana.* The order is clear: A, then B, then the Corrector, and all in the last quarter of the thirteenth century. It is certainly not unreasonable to think that the *Lectura romana* was already in the manuscript when it was sold in the 1280's, within twenty years of Thomas' teaching at Santa Sabina.

Still, that a second commentary on Lombard's *Sentences* was early placed in a manuscript of St. Thomas' Parisian *Scriptum*, even given the apparent circumstances of ownership, does not make it Thomas' Roman commentary. Other features of Lincoln 95 indicate that those who copied this second commentary and those who used this manuscript thought these two commentaries were both the work of Thomas. Let me quickly note some of these features.

I mentioned above the "secundum aliam lecturam fratris Thome." As Fr. Boyle has neatly argued, "alia lectura" ought not be seen from our perspective as referring to the second, Roman *lectura*. Rather, it should be seen from the perspective of Thomas' student at Santa Sabina; for that student, the "alia lectura" is simply the other *lectura*, meaning the first, Parisian *Scriptum*. Thus the placement guide I mentioned above —"these articles can be placed in distinction 2 of the first book secundum aliam lecturam fratris Thome"— is a guide placing the articles of the Roman Commentary in relation to the Parisian *Scriptum.*[6] There are nine other instances of "secundum aliam lecturam fratris Thome" in the manuscript and they are all in hand B. In the mind of B we have here two commentaries on Peter Lombard by Thomas Aquinas.

Although filled in around the Parisian *Scriptum*, the articles of the *Lectura romana* are not placed randomly. B has his eye

6. L. E. BOYLE, "Alia Lectura" cit., pp. 420-421.

squarely on the earlier *Scriptum* when placing this second commentary. The distinctions are together; parallel articles are often found on the same page making for easy comparison.

Some articles give evidence of close comparative reading by B. Fr. Boyle already noted a case in which the initial arguments of the *Lectura romana* are highly abbreviated because they simply replicate the full form found in the Parisian *Scriptum* article beside it.[7] There are a couple of other examples. Sometimes, B corrects A.[8] This much is clear: in copying at least some of these articles, B thinks he is copying St. Thomas and he is yoking articles that share verbatim text.

A few connective marks link articles of the Parisian *Scriptum* and the *Lectura romana*. For example, we find "quaestio" with a three dot connecting siglum in the margin beside an article of the Parisian *Scriptum* and the corresponding three dot siglum with "responsio" is in the margin beside the response of the parallel *Lectura romana*.[9] It is as if to say that here in the Parisian *Scriptum* is the question, but the reader must also read the new response to this question in the *Lectura romana*.

A number of marginal comments link the two commentaries; let me note two.

We find a remarkable pair of marginal notes in distinction 16, where Thomas considers the temporal missions of the Holy Spirit. On one aspect of this topic —whether the visible manifestations are real or not— Thomas changes his mind in the course of his career. The *Lectura romana* reflects the later position of the *Summa Theologiae*, not the early position of the Parisian *Scriptum*. The marginal notes signal this change. Beside the *Lectura romana* we find, "Note: he says the contrary elsewhere, on the third folio at this mark *." Three folios later at the corresponding text of the Parisian *Scriptum* we find this marginal

7. *Ibidem*, p. 421, 24.

8. E.g., *Lectura romana*, 9.2 correcting Parisian *Scriptum*, 9.1.1, (30v marg).

9. E.g., Parisian *Scriptum*, prol.1.3.2 with parallel *Lectura romana*, prol.1.1, (4r).

note: "The contrary at this mark * third folio above."[10] Whoever made these notes thought both of these commentaries to be the work of Thomas Aquinas.

A note in the margin of distinction 21 of the Parisian *Scriptum* reads, "On image, above distinction 2 and at the end."[11] The Parisian *Scriptum* here asks whether image is said essentially. The image of God in man has already been considered "above" in distinction 3 (not distinction 2 as stated in the note). The *Lectura romana* articles of distinction 3 on the image of God are not found "above" but on the back fly leaves of the manuscript "at the end." Thus, if one wanted to consider the discussion of image here in distinction 21 in relation to Thomas' understanding of image in distinction 3, one must look not only "above" which has the articles of the Parisian *Scriptum*, but also "at the end" which has the articles of the *Lectura romana*.

Finally, we should note the case of distinction 19. There are no *Lectura romana* articles for distinctions 18 through 22. Nonetheless, for several articles of distinction 19 of the Parisian *Scriptum*, B has undertaken the correction of the text. In other words, B has a copy of selected Parisian *Scriptum* articles of distinction 19, according to which he is correcting A. For at least part of distinction 19, Thomas taught what he had written in Paris. B does not copy it out; he just proofreads A.

Thus, we have good evidence that B thinks he has a commentary of Thomas on Peter Lombard and that others who have left their mark on the manuscript think so as well.

Let us turn to the Roman Commentary itself.

Although it is squeezed into open spaces, the *Lectura romana* as we have it presents itself as a unity or at least as a significant part of a unity. The articles are organized according to distinction, and fifteen of the nineteen sets of articles have some form of a *divisio quaestionum*. We find twenty-two internal references

10. 43v calc. and 46r marg.
11. 84r.

throughout the *Lectura romana*. Thomas regularly appeals to what he has already shown in previous articles with such phrases as "ut dictum est" and "ut probatum est." These are frequently within a given distinction, but not always. In two instances, Thomas looks to what is to come.

The topics covered are, generally speaking, topics to be expected in the first distinctions of Book I. The articles of the prolog consider the nature of *sacra doctrina*. The articles of distinction 1 define use and enjoyment (*uti et frui*). The eight articles of distinction 2 treat of divine names. The eight articles of distinction 3 consider how we know God, including vestiges and images of the Trinity. Distinctions 4 and 5 address the truth of a number of propositions about the Trinity. Distinctions 6 and 7 consider Trinitarian procession. Distinction 8 considers divine attributes such as being, eternity, immutability, and simplicity. Distinction 9 turns to the second person of the Blessed Trinity, the Son. Distinctions 10 through 16 all consider the Holy Spirit in what is one of St. Thomas' fullest treatments of the Holy Spirit outside of the Parisian *Scriptum*. Distinction 17 considers the virtue of charity. Finally, distinction 23 considers the term "person" and its signification.

Thus, the *Lectura romana* is a true commentary with its own structure and unity, treating, more or less, the requisite topics of Book I of Lombard's *Sentences*.

In the *Lectura romana*, we have a classroom text; indeed, the only classroom text of Aquinas that is not a commentary on Scripture. We see into Thomas' classroom and a classroom of beginners at that. This is not the world of the university disputed questions. This is closer to the world of the *Summa Theologiae*, except that unlike the *Summa*, this is not a product of the study, it truly is a product of the classroom. What might be reflective of Thomas' classroom?

Fr. Santiago Ramírez is reported to have remarked that the four articles he saw seemed a bit loose in their style.[12] The most

12. DONDAINE, "Alia lectura" cit., p. 334, n. 13.

substantial and sustained computer assisted stylometric analysis of the works of Aquinas has been undertaken by Prof. Enrique Alarcón of the University of Navarra. Erik Norvelle, under Prof. Alarcón's direction, has shown that stylometric analysis confirms not only the thomistic authorship of the *Lectura romana* but also situates it most closely with the Parisian *Scriptum* and works of the Roman period.[13]

Features of the prose strike my own humble ear as interesting. We find ideas presented in a clipped way, as points being enumerated; perhaps one hears the cadence of classroom exposition. Do we have here a suggestion of the kind of *collationes* found in Thomas' Isaiah commentary? On the other hand, we find parenthetical explanations, some quite extended —just the kind of thing teachers do in the classroom. Sometimes, Thomas stops to elaborate a point or indicate the implications of a point. For example, having answered the question of whether God is in the category of substance, Thomas concludes the response with "Ex hoc patet" and explains why, therefore, God cannot be defined.[14]

Thomas states that he must speak briefly.[15] We find a focus on the elemental and essential. From the beginning, Thomas is attentive to definition. In distinction 1, Thomas addresses the definitions of *uti* and *frui* more simply and directly than in the Parisian *Scriptum*. I noted above that the *Lectura romana* as we have it jumps from distinction 17 to 23. The correction of some articles of the Parisian *Scriptum* of distinction 19 suggests haste at the end of the school year. But why four new articles for distinction 23? Distinction 23 is the distinction that deals with the definition, signification, and predication of the term "persona." I wonder if Thomas treated this distinction out of order, precisely because of his concern with definition throughout the *Lectura romana*. Even if he did not treat it out of order and simply jumped

13. See E. NORVELLE, *The Authorship of the Roman Commentary: Stylometric and Semantic Approaches to Authorship Indentification*, Master's thesis in the Faculty of Philosophy of the University of Navarra, 2005.

14. 8.3.2.

15. E.g, 9.3.resp.

at the end, the character of the *Lectura romana* as a teaching work suggests just why he would do so.

In addition to terms, Thomas gives attention to propositions and how to understand them. Of the eight articles of distinctions 4 and 5, seven are on the truth of specific propositions. In contrast, the Parisian *Scriptum* on these two distinctions has only one such article. This all strikes me as very much a reflection of a classroom for beginners in theology: how to define terms and how to use them with care and precision in propositions.

In this light we might account for illustrations used by a man not famed for his use of illustrations. For example, in answering the question whether the image of the Trinity is in the memory, intellect, and will with regard to any object or only with regard to God as object, Thomas speaks briefly of how the soul can be more or less fixed on God and thus more or less perfectly an image. He gives by way of example artistic images: some are simply sketched in outline; others are not only sketched in outline but are also colored in. So the soul when it is fixed on God and joined to Him in its intellect is, as it were, an image colored in and perfect.[16]

Most important, however, is the intellectual content, and here is where most of the future study of the *Lectura romana* will rightly and necessarily focus.

There is general agreement that the thought found here is thomistic. Fr. Dondaine raised one notable concern about the claim of reason's ability to know the Trinity. I shall speak to this yet below.

Of the ninety-seven questions posed in the *Lectura romana*, twelve are not found in the Parisian *Scriptum*. Nine of the questions posed are unique. Such numbers, however, do not capture the work. While the majority of the questions are found in the Parisian *Scriptum*, the answers are frequently new. We find any number of arguments and formulations of arguments that are

16. 3.3.3.ad 4m.

simply without parallel elsewhere in Aquinas. Here there is much comparative and analytic work to be done by scholars.

Passages of the *Lectura romana* are found verbatim in other works of Thomas. The most striking instances are in the later *Compendium theologiae*. Other short passages are found verbatim in the disputed questions *De veritate, De potentia,* and *De virtutibus in communi*. A number of passages are found verbatim in the Parisian *Scriptum* as well. All but two are found in the later articles, and all but one are in the initial arguments or the *solutiones argumentorum*. While Thomas is leaning more directly on the Parisian *Scriptum* in the later articles, it is rather more in the framing of the question than in the response.

In addition to verbatim parallels, there are, of course, many conceptual parallels, and these will require study to articulate precisely the nature of the parallel and the placement of it within Thomas' thought. An article in distinction 3, "Whether memory, intelligence and will are substantially in the soul," provides an interesting case with regard to the five initial arguments. Some are parallel with the Parisian *Scriptum*; some with the *Summa Theologiae*. All five initial arguments have parallels in the disputed questions *De spiritualibus creaturis* and *De anima*, both of which are exactly contemporaneous with the *Lectura romana*.

Let me now turn to distinction 2 and consider some aspects of this distinction in more detail; I hope I might provide some sense of the kind of work that lies ahead in the study of the Roman Commentary. Distinction 2 in Peter Lombard's *Sentences* introduces the theological study of the Trinity. This was also Thomas' focus in the Parisian *Scriptum* in which he poses five questions covering the divine unity, the plurality of divine attributes, and the plurality of divine persons. The Trinitarian focus is even clearer if one removes the lengthy article 3 on the plurality of divine names which was added at some later time to the *Scriptum.*[17] The *Lectura romana* is different; Thomas has shifted

17. On that third article, see A. DONDAINE, "Saint Thomas a-t-il disputé à Rome la question des 'attributs divins'? (*I Sent*., dist. 2, qu. 1, art. 3)," *Bulletin*

the focus. The eight articles all pose questions regarding the names of God. The first is the general question: Whether the names said of God signify one or many in God. Four articles on the highest good follow, a topic missing in the Parisian *Scriptum*. The distinction concludes with three articles on the term "Deus." The shift to divine names is clear.

Still, Trinitarian concerns are not absent from distinction 2. In considering the highest good, Thomas asks whether there can be a plurality of persons in the highest good, and in considering the term "Deus," he asks whether "Deus" may be predicated plurally of three persons. As for whether there can be a plurality of persons in the highest good, Thomas does not, in fact, answer the question as posed. Instead, he offers an extended argument from analogy for the plurality of persons in the Trinity.

This article has given rise to questions about the authenticity of the *Lectura romana*. Let me give some attention to the concern first raised by Fr. Dondaine. What immediately concerned Fr. Dondaine was the opening sentence of the response which seemed to treat the doctrine of the Trinity as a matter of reason. "As faith teaches, so reason can consider" ("sicut fides ponit, ita et ratio ... potest considerare"). This "sicut fides/ita ratio" disjunction gives too much to reason. The nominally parallel Parisian *Scriptum* article, by contrast, is much more circumspect: there is no doubt as to the plurality of persons, not because reasons can be given that conclude so necessarily, but because it is a truth of faith. End of response.[18] The contrast with the *Lectura romana* seems stark. In fact, Fr. Dondaine suggests we have in the Roman Commentary the inauguration of a new rationalist method. The

---

*Thomiste* (Notes et communications), 1 (1931-1933), pp. 171*-182*, and IDEM, "Saint Thomas et la dispute des attributs divins (I Sent., d. 2, a. 3): authenticité et origine", *Archivum Fratrum Praedicatorum*, 8 (1938), pp. 253-262.

18. *Sup. I Sent.*, 2.1.4.resp.

early placement in distinction 2, Fr. Dondaine suggests, is a first among commentators.[19]

Fr. Boyle responded that what we have here is the difference between a bachelor in Paris, cautious in his views, and a master in Rome, feeling no such constraints.[20]

In his learned introduction to Fr. Boyle's collected essays on Thomas Aquinas, Fr. Jean-Pierre Torrell has, quite rightly, remarked that Fr. Boyle's response to Fr. Dondaine does not carry much weight.[21] This is not simply a matter of the difference between bachelor and master. This is about the fundamental relationship of faith and reason before one of the central mysteries of the faith. Fr. Torrell notes that the language of intellectual necessity is found throughout the response.[22] This looks to be a significant shift in Thomas' thinking; however, as Fr. Torrell shows, there can be no such shift in Thomas' thinking. He points to *De potentia* 9.5, exactly contemporaneous with Thomas' teaching in Rome, which reads like the Parisian *Scriptum*, not the *Lectura romana*.[23] The rationalist position of the *Lectura romana* thus challenges the authenticity of the work as a work of Aquinas, or at least, challenges the reliability of the copy we find in Lincoln College, Lat. 95. This rationalist character contributed to Fr. Dondaine's initial unwillingness to attribute this work to St. Thomas. With his usual care, Fr. Torrell notes it is best to wait for the critical edition of the *Lectura romana*.

As it is, Fr. Torrell need not go to the *De potentia* to find a text that is in its spirit and letter contrary to the rationalist response of the *Lectura romana*; such a text is to be found in the *Lectura romana* itself. In the very next distinction, distinction 3 on the

19. H. F. DONDAINE, "Alia lectura" cit., p. 320. Fr. Dondaine had a similar concern with a later article of distinction 10, which asks whether the Holy Spirit proceeds as love, p. 331.

20. L. E. BOYLE, "Alia lectura" cit., p. 426.

21. J. P. TORRELL, "Introduction" to L. E. BOYLE, *Facing History* cit., pp. XXIII-XXIV.

22. *Ibidem*, p. XXIV.

23. *Ibidem*.

knowledge of God, we find the following question: "Whether one can come to knowledge of the divine Trinity of persons by natural reasons."[24] The response is clear: "It is to be said that one can never come to knowledge of the divine Trinity of persons through natural reasons." The explanation given is the one Thomas always gives: our natural reason comes to God through his effects, and all that pertains to God in his causality is essential. This is unambiguously thomistic. Given this clear statement from distinction 3, let us revisit the article of distinction 2 that so troubled Fr. Dondaine.

The article is the last of four articles dedicated to the highest good. It asks, you will recall, "Whether there can be a plurality of persons in the highest good." This is not the question to which one would naturally turn to find an author's view on the knowability of the Trinity. The three initial arguments and the sed contra all deal with the highest good. The response does not, and it is here that we find the material of concern to Frs. Dondaine and Torrell.

The response ignores the highest good question and immediately turns to the Trinitarian question. But even the opening sentence is not as absolute as, I think, Fr. Dondaine has made it out to be. The full sentence reads: "It is to be said that as faith proposes, so also reason, although never perfectly, can consider the divine Trinity of persons in unity of essence."[25] The language is perhaps arresting, but Thomas need be saying no more than simply what faith proposes, reason is able to consider imperfectly. "Sicut fides/ita ratio" need not be taken in the disjunctive sense that they work separately; rather, they work complementarily, reason dependent upon faith.

The response is a lengthy one, clear in its contours, in which Thomas gives an analogical account of the Trinity. The response is in two parts. In the first, Thomas argues from analogy by way of

24. 3.1.3.

25. "Dicendum quod sicut fides ponit, ita et ratio, licet non usquequaque perfecte, potest considerare in divinis Trinitatem personarum in unitate essentiae."

divine knowing and willing; in the second, he articulates a critical difference between God and creatures in the analogy.

Let us look to the first part in which Thomas lays out the analogy. He begins with divine perfection. The principal perfections among things are to know and to will (*intelligere* and *velle*); these cannot be lacking in God since God is perfect. Thomas articulates what properly proceeds from knowing in the created order, that is, a word, and what properly proceeds from willing (that is, from loving) in the created order, that is, spirit. Since God is perfect, he must know and will; since word and spirit are proper to knowing and willing, there must be in God a divine word and spirit. Only after making this argument from analogy, does Thomas turn to the proper names of the divine persons and apply them to what he has shown analogically, saying, we call the principle "Father," the word "Son," and the love "Holy Spirit." So the first part of the response.[26]

---

26. "Quia enim Deus est perfectissimus, nulla ei perfectio deest, sicut infra ostendetur. Inter omnes autem perfectiones rerum sunt praecipue intelligere et velle; unde nec Deo deesse possunt. Omnis autem intelligens ex eo quod intelligit, aliquid format in mente sua; et similiter qui vult et amat, habet in mente sua rem amatam. Deus autem perfecte intelligit se et amat. In quantum igitur intelligit se, habet conceptum intellectus sui; in quantum vero amat, habet in mente sua rem amatam. Nam amatum in quantum amatur oportet esse in amante; movetur enim quodammodo <amans> ab amato quadam intrinseca motione. Vnde cum movens contingat id quod movetur, necesse est amatum intrinsecum amanti esse. Intellectum autem sive conceptio intellectus prout est in intelligente, est verbum quoddam intellectus. Hoc enim exteriori verbo significamus quod interius intellectu comprehendimus; sunt enim secundum Philosophum voces signa intellectuum. Illud autem quod est in mente ut res amata est quo movemur ad operandum, in quantum amatum trahit et movet amantem secundum quandam motionem, ut dictum est, ad operandum. Dico ergo quod cum Deus intelligat seipsum, est ibi verbum Dei; et cum amet seipsum perfecte, est in seipso ut amatum in amante. Et ideo oportet ponere in divinis unum quod procedit per modum intellectus, et hoc est verbum Dei, et aliud quod procedit per modum amoris, et hoc est Spiritus Sanctus. Et dicitur 'spiritus' in quantum quid perficitur in attractione amantis ad ipsum amatum, in quo videtur quidam impulsus esse. 'Sanctus' vero dicitur in quantum ipse amor quo summum bonum amatur, eminentem quandam obtinet bonitatem. Ipsum igitur a quo est principium intellectus et voluntatis sive amoris, 'Patrem,' ipsum intellectum sive verbum, 'Filium,' ipsum amorem quo Pater et Filius perfecte amant se, 'Spiritum Sanctum,' dicimus."

In the second part of the response, Thomas states that there is a difference between created knowing and willing on the one hand and divine knowing and willing on the other, namely that what is accidental and intentional in us is essential in God. This is a statement of philosophical fact. He concludes this second part with the application of this fact by way of fittingness to what he has already said of the divine persons: "But because all of these are one in God which pertain to essence, thus it is fittingly said that Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are one God."[27]

In the course of laying this out, Thomas uses language of intellectual necessity four times; this frequency was noted by Fr. Torrell as a matter of concern. But let us see where this language is to be found. In the argument from analogy it appears twice. First, in considering the natural analog of created love, Thomas says that it is necessary that the beloved is intrinsic to the lover. This is a claim on the natural order. The second instance is found in the move from the natural analog to God, namely, that since God knows and loves Himself perfectly, what proceeds by way of knowing and by way of love must be in God. This is a claim for divine operation from divine perfection. The language of necessity is thus found in establishing the natural analog and in the relationship of divine perfection to divine operation analogically

27. "Notandum autem quod differentia est inter intelligere Dei et intelligere nostrum, et inter amare Dei et amare nostrum. Nam cum in nobis aliud sit esse naturale et intelligere, oportet quod verbum in intellectu nostro conceptum habens esse intelligibile tantum, alterius naturae et essentiae sit quam intellectus noster qui habet esse naturale. In Deo autem idem est esse et intelligere. Vnde verbum Dei quod est in Deo cuius est verbum secundum esse intelligibile, idem esse habet cum Deo cuius est verbum, et per hoc oportet quod sit eiusdem essentiae et naturae cum ipso. Et similiter cum res amatae sint in nobis amantibus accidentaliter et intentionaliter, non sunt essentiae nostrae. In Deo autem sicut intelligere est suum esse, ita et amare; non enim amat seipsum secundum aliquid suae essentiae superveniens, sed secundum essentiam suam. Non igitur est Deus in seipso ut amatum in amante accidentaliter sed substantialiter; sicut verbum Dei est eiusdem naturae et essentiae cum Deo Patre, et Spiritus Sanctus. Et cum in divina natura nihil sit nisi subsistens, oportet quod verbum Dei et Spiritus Sanctus habeant esse subsistens, et quaecumque dicuntur de Deo istis conveniant. Sed quia ista omnia sunt unum in Deo quae ad essentiam pertinent, ideo convenienter dicitur quod Pater et Filius et Spiritus Sanctus sunt unus Deus."

considered. At the critical point in the argument when Thomas applies this to the Trinity of divine persons, we find no language of necessity.

Two more instances of the language of necessity are found in the second part of the response which considers the difference between God and creatures. First, because God's *esse* is his *intelligere*, the word that proceeds from divine *intelligere* must be of the same essence and nature with God. The second instance is much like the first with regard to both word and spirit, namely, that since only what is subsisting is in the divine nature, both word and spirit must be *subsistens esse*. These are philosophical points. When Thomas makes the move to the divine persons proper, his language shifts from necessity to fittingness.

Let us now turn to two unquestionably authentic works of St. Thomas.

The contemporaneous *De potentia* 9.5, with its more circumspect opening noted by Fr. Torrell, asks a different question: whether there is a number of persons in the divine. Thomas gives, in fact, the exact same argument from analogy as in the *Lectura romana*; or rather he gives half of it. We find the argument from knowing, developed more fully and technically, without the argument from willing. The distinction between created and divine knowing then follows. The *Lectura romana* has a digest form of the *De potentia* argument from analogy. Likewise, we find the language of intellectual necessity at the critical point of the application of the analogy to God on the basis of his perfection. Thomas says it is necessary to posit knowing in God, and then because there is knowing in God, it is necessary to posit a word in God. In their respective arguments, the two articles of the *De potentia* and the *Lectura romana* are cut from the same cloth.

Even more telling are the parallels with the later *Compendium theologiae*. In the *Compendium* we find the same line of analogical argument from the operation of knowing and willing in creatures, to their operation in God, to their ultimate application to the divine

persons, with the note on the significant difference that God is his operations.[28] The argument is again the same. We must note as well, with Fr. Dondaine, that much of the response in the *Lectura romana* is found in the *Compendium* verbatim. The order is better and clearer in the *Compendium*; it does not flow with the same ease in the *Lectura romana*. Two of the troubling passages of explicit necessity that contribute to the tone of the *Lectura romana* —one in establishing the initial analogy, one in the articulation of the divergence in the analogy— are found verbatim in the text of the *Compendium theologiae*. To my mind this rather softens the immediate charge of a uniquely rationalist climate in the *Lectura romana*.

So, what to make of the peculiar opening sentence —the "sicut fides/ita ratio"— of the *Lectura romana* response? I would say to begin with that Fr. Dondaine's concerns are exaggerated. We find the right caution elsewhere in the *Lectura romana*; the basic line of argument from analogy is vintage Thomas; in fact, it is Thomas in the *Compendium*.

Part of the problem, I think, is the order of the material. If, as in the *Compendium*, we had a clear signal of moving from divine attributes to divine persons and that we are not in the realm of demonstration by reason, but of elucidation by reason, we might not be quite so concernid.[29] The Parisian *Scriptum*, too, is better on this front. In asking the nominally parallel question in distinction 2, Thomas makes the requisite clarification about the limitations of reason before the mystery of the Trinity. He says no more. He can attend to the particulars of the persons of the Trinity as they emerge in subsequent distinctions.

The problem for Thomas in Rome is that such an approach comes at a very high price. I have argued elsewhere that the genius of Thomas' treatment of the Trinity in the *Summa Theologiae* is present in the *Lectura romana* but quite out of order and thus a

28. *Compendium Theologiae*, I.37-48.

29. *Ibidem*, I.36.

source of frustration.[30] Why address the question of divine operation in relation to the divine persons so early when Lombard's text does not require it? For a very simple reason: Thomas' own thought requires it. He has to get it in somewhere — and early— as it grounds so much of his mature Trinitarian thinking. The problem is not that Thomas is now a master and before he was a bachelor; the problem is that he is Thomas Aquinas teaching Peter Lombard. Thus things are out of order, including the more cautious —usually preparatory— language now found after the fact in distinction 3.

We find a further frustration in the order of material in this same article of distinction 2. This argument from analogy is grounded in divine perfection. This is typical of Thomas as we find it also in the *Summa contra gentiles* and the *Summa Theologiae*.[31] The problem in the *Lectura romana* is that Thomas has yet to consider divine perfection, and so he begins the argument saying, "For God is most perfect and no perfection is lacking to him, as will be shown below." He is building his argument on something he has not yet shown. The reason is simple: Lombard has yet to treat divine perfection and so it has not yet come up. But Thomas must get to his argument, regardless of Lombard's order, and so he signals the treatment of perfection later. As it is, Lombard never treats of divine perfection as such in the *Sentences,* and, it turns out, Thomas never does either in the *Lectura romana*. We can see here in distinction 2 that Thomas scrambles to present ideas central to his own teaching on the Trinity that do not fit neatly in a commentary on Lombard. Some he simply must present now; others he can signal and put off. The problem is clear: Thomas' intellectual starting points are not Peter Lombard's.

Will this resolve the concerns of Fr. Torrell? Perhaps not. Fr. Boyle was always clear that our task as editors was not to

30. J. F. BOYLE, "The Ordering of Trinitarian Teaching in Thomas Aquinas' Second Commentary on Lombard's Sentences," *Recherches de Théologie Ancienne et Médiévale*, Supplementa, 1 (1995), pp. 125-136.

31. Cf. *Summa contra Gentiles*, I.37; *Summa Theologiae*, I.4-6.

address all such possible concerns, but simply to edit the text. Others will take up the more important interpretive work. I do hope I have been able to give some sense of just how intriguing and engaging such work promises to be.

John F. Boyle, M.S.L, Ph.D.
Professor of Theology
University of St. Thomas
St. Paul, Minnesota
55105 U.S.A.
email: jfboyle@stthomas.edu