THOMAS AQUINAS AS A SPOKESMAN FOR SCHOLASTICISM

BY

NORMAN L. GEISLER

WHEATON COLLEGE

1957

THOMAS AQUINAS AS A SPOKESMAN FOR SCHOLASTICISM

I. What is Scholasticism?

    A. Its origin and development.

        1. Augustinian scholasticism based on Neo-platonism.

        2. Thomistic scholasticism based on Aristotle.

    B. Its fundamental principle and method.

        1. Its principle.

        2. Its method.

II. How is Aquinas its spokesman?

    A. Thomas' part in the genetic history of scholasticism.

        1. The "man and the moment".

        2. The "sage and the system".

    B. Thomistic solutions to medieval scholastic problems.

        1. The problem of will and intellect.

        2. The problem of universals.

        3. The problem of metaphysical analysis of being.

        4. The problem of faith and reason.

III. Why were Thomistic solutions adequate?

    A. Their contextual relevance.

    B. Their metaphysical insight.

    C. Their historical results.

    D. Their realistic basis.

Although the term "scholastic" was first used as an appellation for teachers in the medieval universities, the historic roots of embryonic scholasticism are traceable to the Augustinian and Neo-platonic strain of Christian philosophizing.[1] Thilly calls Augustine the last of the Christian classicists with whom ends the patristic period of formulating the Christian creeds. It was left then for Augustine's successors to take this fixed body of dogma and demonstrate its rationality. This the schoolmen did in the typical Neo-platonic fashion until the 13th century. However from the death of Augustine in 430 A.D. until the 9th century this apologetic movement hardly produced an outstanding figure with the possible exception of Boethius. So permanent was this tradition that Leighton wrote, "it is no exaggeration to say that the spirit of Neo-platonism and medieval Christianity are identical....Augustine, whose thought dominated the whole of medieval Christianity was himself a Neo-platonic convert from Manicheism".[2] Probably, as A. C. Pegis remarks, "the safest general characteristic of the European philosophic tradition is that it consists in a series of footnotes on Plato".[3]

Add to this the fact that preceding the 12th century Christian philosophers had in their possession only fragmentary translations of the Timaes and practically nothing of Aristotle, and it is not difficult to see why Augustinianism prevailed until the 12th century or later. It wasn't until after the formation of the famous medieval

1. Thilly, History of Philosophy, p. 155.
2. Leighton, The Field of Philosophy, p. 141.
3. A. C. Pegis, St. Thomas and the Greeks, p. 73.

University of Paris in 1200 A.D. that the works of Aristotle made their debut into Christian thinking. Even then, and only naturally so, they were viewed with much scepticism. So much so that as late as April 13, 1231, Pope Gregory IX renewed the indictment against teaching Aristotle until he was "throughly censored and purged".[4] However the intellectual curiousity aroused by a study of Aristotle was so great that by 1366 pontifical authority had made it necessary for students of arts to study the very treatises of Aristotle it had so long forbidden. But even after the initial debut of Aristotle in 1200, theologians were warned to teach theology "in its purity" and "without any admixture of worldly wisdom". Hence, "even to the end of the 13th century and beyond there was a marked tendency to favor philosophical doctrines that could be reconciled with the Neo-platonic Augustinian tradition. It even eventually opposed Thomas Aquinas as late as 1270 A.D.".[5]

With the new influx of Aristotelian philosophy came the inevitable task of its reconciliation with Christian dogma. This was not to be an easy task in light of the deeply rooted Neo-Platonic tradition and even more formidable when we consider the unfavorable circumstances under which Aristotelian literature was introduced. The Latins were initiated to Aristotle by the Arabian philosophers who had been using his philosophy for centuries as a support for their pantheism. Forseeing this task of reconciliation, ecclesiastic authority had set up a commission only 10 days after the initial papal warning for the expressed purpose of purging Aristotle for Christian use. However, no positive results were forthcoming but were awaiting the achievements

---

4. Gilson, The Spirit of Midieval Philosophy, p. 240
5. Gilson, p. 240

of Thomas Aquinas after 1260.[6] It must be noted that the first reaction of the church toward the Aristotelian influx was to stem its tide by papal degree. This Pope Gregory IX did in his warning not to mix philosophy and theology. However, it was soon evident that this was not sufficient, and consequently it became apparent, to some at least, that another course must be pursued. William of Auvergne (1180-1249) saw the necessity of borrowing from the enemy some weapons to fight him. He became increasingly aware that one can only triumph over philosophy as a philosopher. Following in this general direction, Albert the Great concluded that a Christian should know philosophy in all its forms. But his encyclopedic curiousity left the Greek philosophy and Christian religion yet unreconciled. It was in the genius of his pupil Thomas of Aquin that this task was soon to be realized. So great became this urge to show the compatibility of Greek philosophy and Christianity that even Boniventure who took a hostile attitude toward Aristotle said that it was the task of philosophy to render the "credible, intelligible". It was in this sense that Thomas was to bring the work of his predecessors to perfection.

"St. Thomas was faced with a system of growing importance, which seemed in many ways to be incompatible with Christian tradition, yet because of its majesty, coherence, and comprehensiveness, Thomas boldly grabbed the bull by the horns and utilized Aristotle in building his own system. Thomas saw in Aristotle a potential to weld together philosophy and theology into a unified whole."[7] Such intellectual courage has led a modern scholastic to say, "St. Thomas Aquinas, the

---

6. Gilson, p. 244
7. Copleston, History of Philosophy, Vol. II, p. 322

chief glory of scholasticism is the first of modern philosophers because to him is due the epochal achievement of having been the first to constitute philosophy in its own right, to give it a full consciousness of self, independence and autonomy, by establishing on fundamental principles the distinction between philosophy and theology, and assigning to each its proper domain and method".[8]   Maritan says, "the doctrine of Aristotle did not bear its purist fruit except in the mind of St. Thomas Aquinas. Since he always remained true to all the principles of Aristotle, one may say that he is much more purely Aristotelian than Aristotle".[9]

Thus it was that in the 13th century the Neo-platonic strain of scholasticism gave way to Thomistic Aristotelianism.

With this brief historical background in mind we can now examine the fundamental principle of the scholastic movement and its consequent method(s). Needless to say, a simple definition of scholasticism is very difficult, if not impossible to give. There were many scholastics and many centuries of scholasticism. But at least this much is basic to the movement: originally, it was the scholastic task to understand or explain dogma. Weber says, "Philosophy and theology have the same content and interest...in explaining religion philosophy simply expands itself, and in expanding itself it explains religion".[10] From the medieval point of view, dogma was truth. There was no need to search for it. Therefore, there was no place for philosophy as the pursuit of truth. To philosophize meant to demonstrate the truth of revelation. Philosophy was positive theology. Thus it was that

8.   Gerardo Bruni, Progressive Scholasticism, p. VIII
9.   Mc Kenon, Selections from Medieval Philosophy
10. Weber, History of Philosophy, p. 203

Gilson remarked, "...the only safe plan is to take revelation for our guide and make an effort to understand its contents. This understanding of the contents of revelation will be philosophy itself;...this is the basic principle of all medieval speculation".[11]

And so the basic method of scholasticism was to arise from its fundamental principle. If dogma is truth and the scholastic task is merely a matter of making it intelligible or reasonable, then we must defend its validity by reasoning or philosophizing about it. However, the logical consequences of this very principle and its resulting method were destined to change the very nature of the scholastic movement. For the process of rendering dogma intelligible for those who had accepted the Christian revelation as their basic premise was quite different from that of rendering the Christian revelation as rational to those who denied the basic premise of sacred Scriptures. For this was to be the very task of scholasticism with relation to the newly received Aristotelian literature which was introduced through the philosophical mold of the Muslem religion. The question necessary becomes, can Christianity sustain itself on a purely rationalistic grounds that will be acceptable to both Mohammedan and Christian. Thus we can see that the original intent to explain dogma has evolved to the necessity of defending it, and that on an Aristotelian basis. If Christian dogma is to survive this situation, it must emberge from its monistary of platonic idealism and adopt an Aristotelian realism. It must disguard as apologetically relevant, the former deductive reasoning from revelation and build a rational system on an inductive basis that is in harmony with the Christian revelation.

_____

11. Gilson, p. 5

What scholasticism most needed at this stage in its history was a philosophy based not on subjective ideas or presupposed dogma--this the Muslems had too. What was most needed, and expecially in light of the growing importance of Aristotle was a philosophical system based on Aristotelian principles alone that would nevertheless demonstrate the rationality of the universe as a revelation of God and thereby demonstrate its harmony with the Christian revelation. This is precisely what Thomas did, and with little doubt, as no other man had ever done. That no other man has the right to speak for scholasticism as Thomas is unquestioned for at least two reasons. First, he was the right man at the right moment in the genetic development of medieval scholasticism and no other man occupied his "chronologio-historic" or "intellectectio-philosophic" position. At this point we should note that the infiltration of Aristotelian philosophy beginning at about 1200 A.D. gave about half a century FOR Thomas' predecessors to view the task and orienT the procedure. This was very ably done in men like Albert the Great whose prodigious encyclopedic mind amassed materials from far and wide to await the intellectual scrutiny of his pupil's systematic philosophy. Others too, contributed to the stage-setting. There was, for example, Auvergne who first made a clear cut distinction between essence and existence which was later to become the very heart of the Thomistic metaphysical contribution. It is not difficult to see then that "St. Thomas does not speak from some abstract philosophical heaven. It is to the 13th century that he gives voice; to that century, precisely which was the first Christian century to behold and feel the full power of the Greek philosophical genius". Mc Keon further suggests that "the real significance of St. Thomas is not seen until it is

viewed in the astonishing turbulent intellectual life of his century, and that when St. Thomas is so viewed, his relation to the Greeks and their Arabian successors assume the role of a major issue in the form- ation of his thought".[12] So we can easily see that from his contextual relevance to his historic and philosophic circumstances, Thomas Aquinas, with his genius for systematization and devotion to dogma, was precisely the right man at the right moment.

At the same time, there is little doubt that Thomas could ever have been the man of the moment had he not possessed along with his chronological and philosophical environment, the intellectual genius to construct such a sagacious system. For it was his philosophy which not only solved the scholastic dilemma, but in so doing gave adequate solution to the problems which inhibited his predecessors from this success. Even the voluminisity of Thomas' philosophy is amazing when one considers that in a short life time of only 49 years he wrote more than 27 volumes, including discourses on almost any question askable in his day. The Summa Theologia alone, his most mature work, contains some 38 treatises, 3000 articles, and 10,000 objections. His prolifica- cy is even more appreciated when one considers the condensed fashion in which he wrote. Each phrase is compact with metaphysical signifi- cance and phlosophical and theological implications.

However, it is not the mere volume of his writing but the almost impossible task he sets himself to that shows the wisdom of his thoughts. To comprise such a system at such a moment was not an easy task for many reasons. First of all there was the almost unfathomable task of reconciling theological doctrine primarily conceived in a Neo-

---

12.   R. MacKeon, Selections from Medieval Philosophy, p. 2

platonic mold with a now increasingly popular Aristotelian metaphysics.
It was as it were the task of making peace between a Neo-platonic,
theological idealism on one hand with an Aristotelian, metaphysical
realism on the other hand. Even to a genius this was a task of some
undertaking. Concomitant to his reconciliation of these realms there
existed the necessity of giving sufficient answer to the problems
that had inhibited his predecessors success along this line. Such
things as the superiority of the intellect with which he is to reason
must be demonstrated. Along with this he must show how objective
truth is a philosophical possibility. Thus, he must treat the problem
of universal concepts in Epistemology. His system must be complete
and ultimate. Hence it must be grounded in a demonstratable metaphysics.
And finally, he must give voice to the basic issue from which all these
problems originate viz., what are the relative domains of faith and
reason?

As we shall see, it is the answers to these problems that makes
his system adequate and gives him right to be the chief spokesman for
scholasticism.

First, the Thomistic answer to the problem of will and intellect.
To most scholastics and particularly his predecessor this was no
problem at all. From Augustine to the 13th century came an almost
unbroken tradition that held to the superiority of the will over
intellect. But in a real sense this was a problem with deep implications.
The will was a subjective thing. It was at the heart of a system of
Christian idealism. But as we saw, if Thomas was to be relevant in
his task, much less to say successful, he needed something objective and
Aristotelian, not subjective or platonic. This he found in man's
intellect. Thus, for Thomas, to know God is the ultimate end of man.

He argued that all creatures are directed to God as their ultimate end. But man is an intellectual creature. Therefore man is directed to God as his ultimate end through reason. He also concluded that since it is man's innate desire to know the first causes of things, and that we know God is the First Cause of everything, that man's ultimate end is to know God the First Cause of everything. However, he would concede that since in this life we only know God indirectly and the will tends toward Him directly, that to love God is more perfect than to know God. But the superiority of the intellect will reassert itself when we know God directly in the beatific vision.[13] Scotus was later to disagree with Thomas, saying, that since faith and love are conditions of the beatific vision, they are superior virtues. Thomas would admit love as a superior virtue but not as a final end. To know is more ultimate than to will. So with this emphasis on the superiority of the intellect, Thomas brought scholasticism out of its subjective idealism into an objective ~~idealism~~ reason where the ultimate court of appeal in philosophic matters is ~~the mind~~ MAN'S REASON IN ACCORD WITH THE EXTERNAL WORLD. ~~of man~~. Without this emphasis on intellect as over against will, Christian philosophy must retreat to mysticism and consequently defeat. But Thomas is the first to see the full implications of the issue and venture his bold yet adequate solution to it.

Secondly, the Thomistic solution to the problem of "universals" or concepts especially with relation to their ontological status. This question is connected very closely to the superiority of the intellect and in a sense basic to the Thomistic concept of it.

"From the 9th to the 12th century, universals or ideas were

---

13. St. Thomas, Summa Contra Gentiles, Ch. XXV, XXXI

considered primarily in the platonic sense as the real essence of things and _prior_ to their existence."[14] The 13th century witnessed the rise of Aristotelian philosophy and in it universals are considered as real, not however, as prior to things but _in_ them. In the suceeding 14th century universals are considered not as essences at all, but mere concepts or words, sometimes called Aristotelian nominalism. On the one hand then we have the epistemological idealism of Plato, universals are to be found in the mystical world of pure forms, innate in the human mind as the very essence of things and prior to them. To accept this in the 13th century of Thomas would again insure defeat by a retreat into subjective mysticism. On the other hand, the 14th century nominalism, say for example of Scotus, rendered the world unknowable. For if concepts are mere forms, then they tell us nothing about reality at all. Either alternative is to accept the council of dispair for Thomas since both would make object, philosophical truth unknowable or impossible. However, if as Thomas asserts, universals are to be found _in_ things and that "nothing is in the intellect that was not first in the senses",[15] then the reason expressed in the external world is the same as that reason revealed in the human mind. Then, and only then, do we have a rational universe which can be thought out and shown to be in direct harmony with revelation. Thus it can be seen that "the dispute over universals was more than a logical quibble; far reaching metaphysical and theological implications were involved in the answers. The view that our general concepts are not merely subjective ideas in the mind, but have a reality of their own apart from the mind implies that the universe is rational and knowable. It implies that truth

---

14. Thilly, p. 136
15. St. Thomas, _Summa_ Theologia

isn't mere subjective opinion but there is objective truth. The
church found this concept a splendid foundation upon which to lay its
intellectual and ecclesiastical structure".[16] Thus Thomas, by way of
Aristotle, began with the particulars of the external world of all men
and by abstracting their sensible qualities arrived at a knowledge of
their essence which existed in them actually, in man's mind abstractly,
and even in the mind of God previously. That this was an adequate
solution can be seen by the very fact that it made objective knowledge
of the external world, knowable; it made rational philosophy possible;
and hence, revelation can be rendered compatible with reason to all men.

From this epistemological concept of universals arises the entire
metaphysical structure of Thomas. This brings us to the third contribu-
tion of the Thomistic system, that of a metaphysical insight into the
very nature of being. Since the universe is rational, then man can
reason from fact to God by philosophy as theology proceeds from God to
Fact. Since reality is to be found _in_ things, then a careful examina-
tion of these things must tell us something about reality. On the
basis of this fact emmerges his unique metaphysical contribution not
only to medieval scholasticism but to the history of thought in general.
Thomas was the first in the history of philosophy to build an entire
metaphysical system on the distinction between essence and existence
in the order of being. Copleston writes, "Thomism is essentially a
metaphysics. It is a revolution in the history of metaphysical inter-
pretation of the first principle which is 'being'".[17] Though Thomas
adopts Aristotle's definition of metaphysics, that it is the study of

16. Thilly, p.
17. Copleston, p. 308

being as being, yet it is perfectly clear that the task he sets himself
to is the explaination of existent being. In this sense he may be
called an existentialist. But the "esse" of Thomas and the "existenz"
of those who are commonly called existentialists are not to be confused.
Essentially this insight consists of a knowledge of Aristotle's act and
potency correlation in the order of essence combined with Auvergne's
distinction between essence and existence and then applied to the
order of being. The significance of this insight is not at once
apparent, but it too has far reaching consequences. We will remember
that it was the intent of scholasticism and especially of Thomas' day,
to demonstrate the harmony between the realm of faith and that of
reason. Or as Thilly puts it, "to demonstrate the rationality of the
universe as a revelation of God".[18] Now if this be the avowed purpose
of scholasticism, then Thomas alone gave it an explicit philosophical
basis. For example, the Thomistic metaphysical insight is the first
that renders explicitly compatible the Christian notion of creation
ex nihilo with the prevailing metaphysics of the day. Most previous
rational attempts to analyze the universe as a "creation of God"
ended either in an emmination or pantheism on one hand or a scepticism
on the other hand. But since to Thomas, the individual existing beings
of our experience are composed of essence and existence, then something
must account for their here and now existence as beings, or else they
would be non-being. This is true since these beings are obviously con-
tingent from their composite nature. In a composite being of essence
and existence there must be an outside efficient cause for its very
existence or it would be in non-existence. This is so since this

18. Thilly, p. 190

composite being cannot account for its own existence. If its essence caused its existence, then its essence would have to exist in order to cause. But in that case it would exist before it existed which is impossible. And again, if its essence were identical with its existence, then it would be its essence to exist and this is a necessary being. But it is obviously a contingent being since it changes. So we must conclude that there is an extrinsic cause of the very existence of beings in our experience. When this cause causes, a being exists. When it doesn't cause, then a being doesn't exist. Thus the idea of creation from nothing to something, from non-existence to existence, is a metaphysical possibility, yea, to Thomas an actual-ality.

Another implication in this unique metaphysical discovery is its solution to the age old problem of the one and the many. It will be remembered that Heriolitus denied being because everything was changing and Parmenides held the oneness of being saying that if being changed it would have to become non-being since non-being is the only thing other than being. So he denied multiplicity because of the logic of unity. What is the solution to this dilemma. For St. Thomas it was merely the application of his metaphysical distinction between essence and existence. Since a given being is a composite of essence and existence, it can change without becoming non-being and yet retain its unity as a being. If it were simple (i. e. without parts), then it couldn't change. But since it has one part to account for its "sameness" (viz., existence) and one part to explain its "difference" (Viz., essence), then it shows both the unity of being in as much as beings all exist or are "in act" and the multiplicity of being in

as much as they are "in potency". So act is to potency as existence
is to essence as the one is to the many.

Not only does this contribution stand out as unique in the history
of thought, but it, along with Thomistic epistemology, serve as a
basis for his scholastic synthesis of dogma and philosophy. Thus we
come to our last point: the Thomistic solution of the problem of
faith and reason. What are the relative domains of faith and reason?
This was a moot question in medieval times. Various scholastics
expressed themselves on the subject. Bonaventure opposed philosophy
per se as the enemy of theology. Albert the Great saw the implications
of Greek philosophy as against the Christian faith, but left the two
realms as he found them, unreconciled. Scotus even denied the
demonstratability of faith. Thus it was left for Thomas to solve the
scholastic dilemma created by the influx of Aristotelian philosophy and
the avowed purpose of scholasticism to make religion rational. The
Thomistic solution consists in a clear cut distinction between the
two realms. What man can attain by reason in the philosophical
realm must ever be kept separate from what man accepts by faith in
the religious realm. This is not to say that there is no similarity
or harmony between them but on the contrary the most profound harmony
existed since there was no longer any battlefield on which to fight for
no one truth is properly the object of both philosophy and religion.
At this point we may interject that it is felt by some that in so
separating the realms of faith and reason, Thomas changed the nature of
scholasticism and laid down a distinction which ultimately overthrew
the system. This possibility we do not doubt, but it must be noted
that while it is quite possible the Thomistic answer departs from the
original intent of scholasticism and perhaps even changed it course,

it is nevertheless a demonstratable fact that Thomas did solve the
medieval scholastic problem of the 13th century and did set up a
distinction that is held almost universally among scholastics of our
day. While his distinction or a misunderstanding of it may have
created resultant problems, there is little doubt that it did solve
the medieval scholastic problems for which Thomas spoke as a scholastic.

We conclude, then, that Thomistic solutions to the medieval
scholastic problems were adequate for several reasons. First, because
of their historic relevance. From one point of view, this could very
well be the most important reason and the key to all the others.
Thomas was precisely the man that history in his day demanded to be
successful. In a sense, all four of his solutions were appropos, but
expecially his emphasis on intellect. What more could be desired in
a day of intellectual confidence than for one to demonstrate that the
supreme act of man is one of knowing. No other Christian philosopher
to his day had so enthroned man's intellect and yet subordinated it
to be the servant of revelation. The relevance of this contribution
fit the context of his day so well that its influence is reflected in
Christian philosophizing even in our day.

Secondly, Thomistic solutions were sufficient because of their
metaphysical insight. "When St. Thomas insisted that God was subsistent
existence (not the "Thought" of Aristotle or the "Goodness" of Plato),
he was but rendering explicit the implications of the Jewish and
Christian view of the world's relation to God."[19] This metaphysical
insight rendered the revelation of God as the ever present, "I am",
His creative activity, and sustaining power more than a philosophical
possibility but a metaphysical reality. To this Thomistic insight
into the very nature of reality must go the credit for making much of

19. Coplestone, p. 506

the previous incomprehensive dogma, now demonstratable.

Thirdly, and connected very closely with his metaphysical insight are the historic results in which it issued. "Because Thomas Aquinas had tackled the fundamental problem of metaphysics, things began to move even before his death. The extraordinary flowering of philosophical speculation between 1277-1350 can be considered as an after effect of this theological and metaphysical reform."[20] Expecially illustrative of this fact was the hitherto perplexing, but now resolved problem between faith and reason with their limitations and scope. His solution led to the ultimate freedom of one from the other which both philosophy and theology have enjoyed ever since. Though it may be contended with some validity that it was this strict separation that led to the ultimate overthrow of the scholastic movement by the hands of the nominalist doctors, yet it is also worthy of note that the distinction did solve the immediate problem as to where Greek philosophy fit into the Christian system, and also that this distinction has had a far reaching historic result within the bos#om of Catholicism down through the centuries and is officially recognized and almost universally practiced in the Roman system yet today.

But the relevance of Thomism is not seen so clearly outside the church until we come to the fourth reason, namely, that his solutions had a realistic appeal.* His answers were grounded in external reality, in the observable data daily flashing itself on the sense consciousness of all men. This could not be said of the Neo-platonic Augustinian idealism or its subjective tradition in the scholastics. But when Aristotelian realism asserted its right in Christian thinking by the

---

20. Coplestone, p. 363
   * COPLESTONE, P. 308

voice of Thomas, Christianity emmerged from its mystic shell and
"other-worldliness" and began to engage in apologetic thinking that
could be squared with external reality. It should be noticed that the
importance of this is more closely connected to Thomas' solution of
the nature of universals. The only concept of a universal adequate
for a realism is that ideas or forms have a real existence _in_ things.
The question of universals has been raised in many ways.[21] In medieval
times it was an ontological question. What, if anything, in the
extramental reality corresponds to the universal concept in the mind?
Of course from their theological orientation, most medieval attempts to
answer this were based on the desire to save the objectivity of
knowledge. The first attempt was that of an exaggerated realism.
Things exist in the mind in the same way that they existed outside the
mind. This view assumes that the only way to save the objectivity of
knowledge is to maintain an exact correspondence between thought and
thing. "This tends to Monism. If object and subject are identical,
then all beings are modifications of one being."[22]

The second answer was that of a reaction to the ultra realism of
the first. Only individual things exist. General concepts are only
names. This was a nominalism. There was a touch of this in Abelard
who said that universal concepts are formed by abstraction which
conceives _what_ is in the object, but doesn't conceive it _as_ it is in
the object. The treatment of Abelard was considered a death blow to
ultra realism. Add to this decisive treatment the statement of John
of Salsbury that "anyone who looks for genera and species outside the
things of sense is wasting his time"[23] and the stage is set for the

---

21. If we ask how universals are formed, then it is psychological.
22. This teaching is implied in John Scotus Eriugena
23. Coplestone, p. 141

moderate realism of Thomas. Thomas held in a modified Neo-platonic way that universals exist in God's mind prior to things, but in an Aristotelian fashion he held that universals exist in things actually and also after things in man's mind by abstraction. By so sythesizing he spared realism from the extremes of scepticism at the hands of the nominalist and subjectivism at the hands of the idealist.

Thomas concluded that universals are mental constructions but they have an objective foundation since they arise from a comparison and abstraction of real things. So we suggest that the Thomistic solutions to the named problems and especially the nature of universals was an adequate one since it spared the objectivity of knowledge and based epistemological and metaphysical speculation on a realistic footing.

And in conclusion, we propose that Thomas as a spokesman for scholasticism gave an adequate answer to the medieval scholastic problems of: 1) The will and intellect; 2) The nature of universals; 3) The metaphysical analysis of being; 4) The relative domains of faith and reason, and that these solutions were adequate because: 1) They were contextually relevant; 2) They show a profound meta- physical insight; 3) They produced historic results; 4) They had a basic realistic approach.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aquinas, St. Thomas, Summa Contra Gentiles.

Aquinas, St. Thomas, Summa Theologia.

Coplestone, History of Philosophy in the Middle Ages. Vol. II

Gilson, The Spirit of Medieval Philosophy.

Hitter, Fr., Class notes taken at University of Detroit, 1956

Mc Keon, Selections from Medieval Philosophy.

Klubertanz, Metaphysics of Infinite Being.

Leighton, Field of Philosophy.

Pegis, A. C., St. Thomas and the Greeks.

Thilly, History of Philosophy.

Toner, Fr., Class notes taken at University of Detroit, 1956

Weber, History of Philosophy.

PRO SEMINAR

THOMAS AQUINAS AS A SPOKESMAN FOR SCHOLASTICISM

I. What is Scholasticism?

    A. Its origin and development.

        1. Augustinian scholasticism based on Neo-Platonism.

        2. Thomistic scholasticism based on Aristotle.

    B. Its fundamental principle and method.

        1. Its principle.

        2. Its method.

II. How is Aquinas its spokesman?

    A. Thomas' part in the genetic history of scholasticism.

        1. The "man and the moment".

        2. The "sage and the system".

    B. Thomistic solutions to medieval scholastic problems.

        1. The problem of will and intellect.

        2. The problem of universals.

        3. The problem of metaphysical analysis of being.

        4. The problem of faith and reason.

III. Why were Thomistic solutions adequate?

    A. Their contextual relevance.

    B. Their metaphysical insight.

    C. Their historical results.

    D. Their realistic basis.

Norman Geisler

October 28, 1957