

Durandus of Saint-Pourçain
IN PETRI LOMBARDI SENTENTIAS THEOLOGICAS COMMEN-
TARIORUM LIBRI IIII
Lib. II, dist. 34, q. 1¹

Outline of the question:

1. First argument that good is an absolute.
2. Second argument . . .
3. Third argument . . .
4. Fourth argument . . .
5. Fifth argument . . .
6. Contra.
7. Responsio. Three tasks.
- 8–11. First task.
- 12–22. Second task.

12. Three theses.
13. First argument ad (i).
14. Second argument ad (i).
15. Third argument ad (i).
16. Fourth argument ad (i).
17. First argument ad (ii).
18. Second argument ad (ii).
19. Third argument ad (ii).
- 20–22. Ad (iii).

23–27. Third task.

23. Ad (1).
24. Ad (2).
25. Ad (3).
26. Ad (4).
27. Ad (5).

¹Latin text is from: Venetiis, MDLXXI, ex typographia Guerræa. Republished: Ridgewood, NJ: Gregg Press, 1964. I have expanded the abbreviations (rather quickly so errors are quite likely), except names and titles, and changed *u*'s and *v*'s according to modern conventions.

Whether the nature of good is absolute or respective (Utrum ratio boni sit absoluta an respectiva)

Thomas Aquinas, *ST* Ia.5.5

1. It is asked about this distinction with respect to the nature of bad. **And because right is the judge of it and the oblique. Therefore, it may be asked with respect to the nature of good to which bad is opposed as the oblique by right. It is asked first, therefore, whether the nature of good is absolute or respective.** And it is argued that it is absolute. First, because no relation formally expresses perfection, but good seems formally to introduce perfection, because each thing, insofar as it is good, is perfect to that extent. Therefore, good does not formally express relation, but something absolute.

Circa distinctionem istam quæritur de ratione mali. Et quia rectus est iudex sui & obliqui, ideo quæretur de ratione boni cui malum opponitur tanquam obliquum recto. Quæritur ergo primo, utrum ratio boni sit absoluta, an respectiva. Et arguitur quod sit absoluta. Primo, quia nulla relatio dicit formaliter perfectionem, sed boni videtur formaliter importare perfectionem, quia unumquodque in tantum est bonum, in quantum est perfectum, ergo bonum non dicit formaliter relationem, sed aliquid absolutum.

2. Second, this, that what is essentially converted with being cannot formally express relation, because not all being is formally relation. But good is converted with being, and essentially, as it seems to certain people. Therefore, etc.

Secundo sic, illud quod convertitur cum ente essentialiter non potest dicere relationem formaliter, quia non omne ens est formaliter relatio. Sed bonum convertitur cum ente & essentialiter, ut quibusdam videtur, ergo etc.

3. Third, this, that what formally expresses relation expresses that which expresses as to another or as of another, because the being (*esse*) of a relation is being to another (*esse ad aliud*). But good is not of this kind, because it does not always and necessarily introduce being good of another. For Augustine says in multiple places in *De Trinitate* that good and just and similar things are said concerning themselves. Wherefore, etc.

Tertio sic, illud quod formaliter dicit relationem dicit illud quod dicit, ut ad alterum, vel ut alicuius, quia relationis esse, est ad aliud esse, sed bonum non est huiusmodi, quia non importat semper & necessario esse alicuius bonum. Nam August. dicit in pluribus locis de trinit. quod bonum & iustum, & similia ad se dicuntur, quare etc.

4. Fourth, good in God does not express a relation, so neither in creatures. The consequence is thought because good in God and in creatures has a certain similarity, at least analogically. The proof of the antecedent: because if good in God were to express a relation, it would either express a conceptual relation or a real relation. But not a conceptual relation, because

then good would be a conceptual being, nor would it be in things, which contradicts what is said in *Metaphysics* 6, [namely,] that good and bad are in things.² If, however, it expresses a real relation. On the contrary, because it expresses a relation to something either within divinity or without. Not within, because such relations are not common to all persons. Good, however, belongs (*convenit*) equally to all. Neither to something without. First, because many posit that God has no real relation to things outside. Second, because it would follow that God would be good as a result of a disposition to creatures and, consequently, that his goodness would in some way depend on creatures, which is false.

Quarto bonum in Deo non dicit relationem, ergo nec in creatura, consequentia patet, quia bonum in Deo & in creatura habent quandam similitudinem saltem analogice. Probatio antecedentis, quia si bonum in Deo diceret relationem, aut diceret relationem rationis, aut realem. Non relationem rationis, quia tunc bonum esset ens rationis, nec esset in rebus cuius contrarium dicitur 6. met. quod bonum & malum sunt in rebus. Si autem dicat relationem realem. Contra, quia aut dicit relationem in divinis ad intra aut ad extra, non ad intra, quia tales relationes non sunt communes omnibus personis, bonum autem æqualiter omnibus convenit: nec ad extra. Primo, quia multi ponunt quod Deus nullam relationem realem habet ad extra. Secundo, quia sequeretur quod Deus esset bonus ex habitudine ad creaturas, & per consequens quod sua bonitas aliquo modo dependeret a creatura, quod est falsum.

5. Fifth, because everything that moves is something absolute. But good moves appetite. Therefore, it is something absolute.

Quinto, quia omne quod movet est aliquid absolutum, sed bonum movet appetitum, ergo est aliquid absolutum.

6. ON THE CONTRARY. Good and agreeability seem to introduce the same [thing] formally, but agreeability formally expresses a relation. Therefore, good also.

CONTRA. Bonum & conveniens videntur importare idem formaliter, sed conveniens dicit formaliter relationem, ergo & bonum.

7. RESPONSE. Concerning this question will be proceeded thus: because first is posited that which certain others think concerning the question. And, second, it will be argued against that position which concludes that which I believe more true. And, third, to reasons to the contrary will be responded.

RESPONSIO. Circa quæstionem istam procedetur sic, quia primo ponetur illud quod de ista quæstione sentiunt quidam alii. Et secundo arguetur contra positionem illam concludendo illud quod credo verius. Et tertio respondebitur ad rationes in contrarium.

²Is the reference to *Meta.* V 1020b24–25?

8. Insofar as the first [task], certain people premise two distinctions by which premises they respond to the question. The distinctions which are premised are about the terms of the question, namely, concerning ‘absolute’ and ‘relative’, and concerning the convertibility of good with being. The first distinction is that what is absolute can be taken in two ways: **in one way through not having been determined or contracted,³ just as if it were said that ‘animal’ expresses sensitive nature absolutely (that is, not contracted) according to human or horse, and absolute thus taken is not set against relative but against the contracted. In another way ‘absolute’ is said just as it is set against ‘to hold itself with respect to another’ (*ad aliud se habere*) and in this mode ‘absolute’ is set against ‘relative’.**

Quantum ad primum præmittunt quidam duas distinctiones quibus premissis respondent ad quæstionem. Distinctiones quæ præmittuntur sunt de terminis quæstionis scilicet de⁴ absoluto & relativo, & de convertentia boni cum ente. Prima distinctio est ista quod absolutum dupliciter potest accipi: uno modo pro non determinato vel contracto, sicut si diceretur quod animal dicit naturam sensitivam absolute (hoc est non contractam) ad hominem vel equum, & absolutum sic acceptum non distinguitur contra relativum, sed contra ad contractum. Alio modo dicitur absolutum, prout distinguitur contra ad aliud se habere, & isto modo absolutum distinguitur contra relativum.

9. The second distinction is that something can be converted with being in two ways; in one way, essentially, in the other, denominatively. In the first way, a thing is converted with being, because every entity beside the soul is essentially reality and from the converse. In the second way, when one is not another essentially and formally, nevertheless one is not found without the other, just as created being and relation, because by it having been given that not every created essence is a relation, nevertheless, no created essence is found without a relation. And therefore they are converted denominatively.⁵

Secunda distinctio est quod potest converti cum ente dupliciter uno modo essentialiter, alio modo denominative. Primo modo res convertitur cum ente, quia omnis entitas extra animam est essentialiter realitas, & e converso. Secundo modo quando unum non est alterum essentialiter & formaliter, tamen unum non invenitur sine altero, sicut ens creatum & relatio, quia dato quod non omnis essentia creata sit relatio, nulla tamen essentia creata invenitur sine relatione, & ideo convertuntur denominative.

10. With these things having been supposed, they say that either ‘absolute’ is taken in the first way, namely, through not being contracted, or, in the second way, one may see

³The idea presumably is that the ‘rational’ in ‘rational animal’ contracts ‘animal’, since it further narrows the extension of the term.

⁴‘... quæstionis.s.de ...’

⁵The idea here is that we can assume that not every created essence is a relation, yet it is still true that there are no created essences without relations. Still, created essences and relations are not convertible in any way other than denominatively. Denominative convertibility is a weaker kind of convertibility than is at stake in the well-known thesis of the convertibility of the transcendentals.

just as it is distinguished from ‘relative’ good always expresses something absolute, because either good is converted essentially with being and then good expresses an absolute, that is, not contracted, just as also being, or it is converted with being denominatively and then it expresses an absolute as it is distinguished from a relation. And because first it is known that that meaning of ‘absolute’ is not in accordance with the understanding of the question.

Therefore, second, they show that it must be accepted that good formally expresses likewise what is perfection or something ordered to perfection. And because perfection does not formally express relation but an absolute nature which is the foundation of relation, therefore, following those, good does not formally express a relation but an absolute. That, moreover, good expresses perfection or something ordered to it, they show with one argument. Thus: The nature of good expresses an end or something that is for an end, and as such, but whatever of these expresses perfection or that which is ordered to perfection, therefore, etc. The major stands because the nature of good consists in that which is to be an end or something ordered to an end. The minor of the easy is shown, namely, that the nature of an end and of that which is for an end is to be perfected or ordered to perfection, because an end is in two ways, namely, an end within and an end without. And in either way it is always called an end from that which is something more perfect to these which are for the end. Those, however, which are for the end seem perfect either strictly speaking or in accordance with that as they are ordered to the end. And there was the minor. The conclusion, therefore, follows, namely, that the formal nature of good is the nature of perfection or of that which is ordered to perfection. And through this they respond to the argument for opposite when it is said that good and agreeability introduce the same. They say that it is true in accordance with agreeability expressing relation not formally but fundamentally. And agreeability thus taken is nothing other than the perfecting of the thing, as the perfection of it or pertaining to its perfection.

His suppositis dicunt quod sive absolutum accipiatur primo modo scilicet pro non⁶ contracto, aut secundo modo, videlicet prout distinguitur contra relativum bonum semper dicit aliquid absolutum, quia vel bonum convertitur essentialiter cum ente, & tunc bonum dicit absolutum, id est, non contractum, sicut & ens, vel convertitur cum ente denominative, & tunc dicit absolutum, prout distinguitur contra relationem. Et quia primum est notum, nec illa acceptio absoluti est secundum intellectum quaestionis.⁷ Ideo secundum probant accipiendo quod bonum formaliter,⁸ dicit idem quod perfectio vel aliquid ordinatum ad perfectionem. Et quia perfectio non dicit formaliter relationem, sed naturam absolutam quæ est fundamentum relationis, ideo secundum eos bonum formaliter non dicit relationem, sed absolutum, quod autem bonum dicat⁹ perfectionem, vel aliquid ordinatum ad ipsam, probant unica ratione: sic. Ratio boni dicit finem, vel illud quod est ad finem, & ut sic, sed quodlibet istorum dicit perfectionem, vel illud

⁶ ... primo modo. s. pro non ...

⁷ ... qōnis.

⁸ ... accipiendo q bonum formaliter ...

⁹ ... absolutum, q aūt bonū dicat ...

quod est¹⁰ ordinatum ad perfectionem, ergo etc. Maior patet, quia ratio boni consistit in hoc quod est esse finem, vel aliquid ordinatum ad finem. Minor de facili probatur scilicet quod ratio finis¹¹ & eius quod est ad finem sit esse perfectum, vel ad perfectionem ordinatum, quia duplex est finis scilicet finis intra¹² & finis extra, & utroque modo semper dicitur finis ex hoc quod est¹³ aliquid perfectius his quæ sunt ad finem. Ea autem quæ sunt ad finem videntur perfecta vel simpliciter, vel secundum quid prout ordinantur ad finem. & hæc fuit minor. sequitur ergo conclusio scilicet quod formalis ratio boni¹⁴ sit ratio perfectionis, vel eius quod est ordinatum ad perfectionem. Et per hoc respondent ad argumentum in oppositum quando dicitur quod bonum & conveniens important idem, dicunt quod verum¹⁵ est secundum quod conveniens dicit non relationem formaliter, sed fundamentaliter. Et conveniens sic acceptum nihil aliud est quam perfectivum rei,¹⁶ sicut eius perfectio, vel pertinens ad perfectionem.

11. They add, moreover, to the major declaration of their words that the nature of good is different from the nature of being, not such that the nature of good expresses something different in reality or conceptually from all being and from every mode of being. But because it expresses something different from that which occurs first concerning whatever entity, as, that is, by whatever is found. For that which first occurs concerning whatever entity is that in accordance with which something is said to be such, for example, white in accordance with whiteness, hot in accordance with heat, and likewise for others. Good, moreover, expresses entity just as it pertains to the perfection of something. Hence, just as differences (for example, rationality) do not express something different in reality from animality, as has commonly been said, but expresses animality under a specific nature, namely, as it is such and thus contracted, and through this is said to differ from that in accordance with reason, because it expresses that also under a different concept from that which first occurs concerning animality.

Therefore also goodness expresses entity under a determinate mode, which differs in reason from that which first occurs concerning entity in whatever it is and of whomever it is, but this lies between this determination and that, because the determination of genus through the difference is on the part of the subject, for example, to being this and on account of this name is converted with the genus. But the determination of being through good is not on the part of the subject, because they are converted. Not being to being this and not to that, but to being of this. For although something is to be of this that is not the good of this, it is nevertheless good strictly speaking because there is no being that does not pertain or that is not produced to pertain to the perfection of something. An example is wine that is not good for the weak but is nevertheless good for the healthy or feverish heat which is

¹⁰... illud q est ...

¹¹... probatur.s.quod rō finis ...

¹²... finis.s. finis

¹³... hoc q est ...

¹⁴... conclusio.s.quod formalis rō boni ...

¹⁵... dicunt q verum ...

¹⁶... aliud ē q perfectiuū rei ...

not good for a human insofar as he is human but nevertheless is good for a human as he is a degree because no heat is repugnant to degree but is the perfection of it or of something prior to it—for example, matter—and thus every entity is some goodness and of something, although not of something determinate. This is the position of some along with their motives and declarations.

Addunt autem isti ad maiorem declarationem dicti sui, quod ratio boni est diversa a ratione entis, non sic quod ratio boni dicat aliquid diversum re vel ratione ab omni ente, & ab omni modo entitatis. Sed quia dicit aliquid diversum ab eo, quod primo occurrit de qualibet entitate, prout id est quolibet¹⁷ invenitur. Illud enim quod primo¹⁸ occurrit de qualibet entitate, est quod secundum eam aliquid dicitur esse tale, puta secundum albedinem album, & secundum calorem calidum, & sic de aliis: bonum autem dicit entitatem, prout pertinet ad perfectionem alicuius. unde sicut differentia (puta rationalitas) non dicit aliquid diversum re ab animalitate communiter dicta, sed dicit animalitatem sub speciali ratione, scilicet ut est talis,¹⁹ & sic contracta, & per hoc dicitur differre ab ea secundum rationem, quia dicit illud idem sub ratione differente ab eo quod primo occurrit de animalitate, ita & bonitas dicit entitatem sub determinato modo, qui differt ratione ab eo quod primo occurrit de entitate in quocunque sit & cuiuscunque sit, sed hoc interest inter istam determinationem & illam, quia determinatio generis per differentiam est ad partem subiectivam, puta ad esse hoc, & propter hoc nomen convertitur cum genere. Sed determinatio entis per bonum non est ad partem subiectivam, quia convertuntur. nec est ad esse hoc, & non ad illud, sed ad esse huius. Nam quanvis aliquod esse sit huius quod non est bonum huius, est tamen bonum simpliciter, quia nullum ens est quod non pertineat, vel non sit natum pertinere ad perfectionem alicuius. Exemplum de vino quod non est bonum infirmo, est tamen bonum sano: & de calore febrili qui non est bonus homini ut est homo, qui tamen est bonus homini, ut est quantus, quia nullus calor repugnat quanto, sed est perfectio eius, vel alicuius antecedentis ad ipsum puta materiæ, & sic omnis entitas est aliqua bonitas & alicuius, quamvis non huius determinate. Hæc est positio aliquorum cum motivis & declarationibus suis.

12. Insofar as the second [task], I intend to argue against what the preceding view says. The first is that good can be converted with being essentially, and thus good expresses something absolute, that is, [something] not contracted. The second is that if good is not converted with being essentially, but denominatively, then good expresses an absolute, as is distinguished from relatives. The third is about that that says that good formally expresses perfection or something ordered to it, and concerning the declaration which they add that good contracts being.

¹⁷... prout ī quolibet ...

¹⁸Illud.n.quod primo ...

¹⁹... ratione,s. ut est talis ...

Quantum ad secundum intendo arguere contraria quæ dicit præcedens opinio. Primum est quod bonum potest converti cum ente essentialiter, & sic bonum dicit aliquid absolutum, hoc est non contractum. Secundum est quod si bonum non convertatur cum ente essentialiter, sed denominative, tunc bonum dicit absolutum, prout distinguitur contra relativum. Tertium est de hoc quod dicit, quod bonum dicit formaliter perfectionem vel aliquid ordinatum ad ipsam, & de declaratione quam addunt qualiter bonum contrahit ens.

17. Against the second statement, it is argued triply with what must be shown that good does not formally express something absolute but a respect of agreeability founded in something absolute. First thus, if good formally expresses something absolute which is the foundation of agreeability and not that very respect of agreeability, then bad formally expresses a privation of such a foundation and not a privation of agreeability, because bad is a privation of good, but this is false. Therefore, also the first, that this is false, is manifestly evident, because following the others and following the truth that the heat of fever is bad to a human insofar as he is human. This, however, is not on account of a lack in the heat, but on account of the lack of agreeability. For it **is** heat, but not agreeable, therefore etc.

Contra secundum dictum arguitur tripliciter ostendendo quod bonum non dicit formaliter aliquid absolutum, sed respectum convenientiæ fundatum in aliquo absoluto. Primo sic, si bonum dicit formaliter aliquid absolutum quod est fundamentum convenientiæ & non ipsum respectum convenientiæ, tunc malum dicit formaliter privationem talis fundamenti & non privationem convenientiæ, quia malum est privatio boni, sed hoc est falsum, ergo & primum, quod hoc sit falsum, patet manifeste, quia secundum alios, & secundum veritatem calor febrilis est malus homini in quantum homo, hoc autem non est propter defectum caloris, sed propter defectum convenientiæ, est enim calor,²⁰ sed non conveniens, ergo etc.

18. Second thus, opposite absolutes cannot at the same time agree with the same thing in the same way, just as the same body cannot at the same time in the same part be white and black which are opposed contrariwise. Nor can the same eye at the same time be blind and seeing which are opposed privatively. And likewise for all other absolutes. Nor is it proper to add with respect of the same thing, because absolutes do not include respects in their intrinsic nature according to which they are opposed and according to which it continues among those things according to which opposites and impossibilities are compared to whatever other thing, as is clear in the examples given and in whatever other absolutes. For this is spiritual in relations from the very nature of relations which is to toward something, that opposites

²⁰ . . . est.n.calor . . .

can at the same time in the same things inhere with respect to different things, just as the same [person] is a father and a son with respect to different [people]. And the same human through the same whiteness is similar to white [things] and dissimilar to black [things], but is not at the same time white and black with respect to whatever, because whiteness and blackness are absolutes, [while] similitude and dissimilitude are relations. Now is such that good and bad, which are opposed privatively at the same time agreeable to the same thing and in the same way although not with respect to the same thing just as wine is good for the strong and bad for the weak and the same heat of fever is bad for a human with respect to the complexion owed to him, and is good with respect, as our adversaries say. Therefore, good and bad are not absolutes, but with respect of agreeability and the privation of it.

Secundo sic, opposita absoluta non possunt simul convenire eidem & secundum idem, sicut idem corpus secundum eandem partem non potest simul esse album & nigrum quæ opponuntur contrarie, nec idem oculus potest simul esse cæcus, & videns quæ opponuntur privative, & sic de omnibus aliis absolutis, nec oportet addere respectu eiusdem, quia absoluta non includunt respectum in sua intrinseca ratione secundum quam opponuntur, & secundum quam remanet inter ea secundum se opposito & impossibilitas ad quicquid aliud comparentur, ut patet in exemplis adductis & in quibuscunque aliis absolutis, hoc enim est spirituale in relationibus ex ipsa natura relationum quæ est esse ad aliud, quod opposita possunt simul eidem inesse respectu diversorum, sicut idem est pater & filius respectu diversorum, & idem homo per eandem albedinem est similis albis, & dissimilis nigris, sed non est simul albus & niger respectu quorumcunque, quia albedo & nigredo sunt absoluta, similitudo & dissimilitudo sunt relationes, nunc est ita quod bonum & malum, quæ opponuntur privative simul conveniunt eidem, & secundum idem quanvis non respectu eiusdem sicut vinum est bonum sano, & malum infirmo, & idem calor febrilis est malus homini respectu complexionis sibi debitæ, & est bonus respectu quantitatis suæ, ut adversarii dicunt, ergo bonum & malum non sunt absoluta, sed respectu convenientiæ, & privatio eius.

19. Third thus from their statement, that whose formal nature consists in this which is being of this is formally something having respected, but the formal nature of good consists in this which is being of this. Therefore etc. The major is evident of itself: because being of this formally expresses a respect. The minor is shown: because the formal nature of good consists in that and not only of a foundation through which good contracts being, but good through this which is being of this, as our very adversaries say. Therefore etc.

Tertio sic ex dicto eorum, illud cuius formalis ratio consistit in hoc quod est esse huius, est formaliter respectus aliquis, sed formalis ratio boni consistit in hoc quod est esse huius, ergo etc. Maior patet de se: quia esse huius dicit respectum formaliter. Minor probatur: quia in illo consistit ratio formalis boni, & non solum fundamentalis per quod bonum contrahit ens, sed bonum per hoc quod est esse huius, ut ipsimet adversarii dicunt, ergo etc.

22. Therefore, it should be said that the formal nature of good is of agreeability, so that good is formally agreeability itself and contracts entities on the part of the subject, which is a relation and by the kind of relation which is agreeability. And thus every goodness is a certain entity which is a respect, but not every entity is quidditatively goodness, so that they are not converted essentially. But good by nature of the matter (*concretionis*) introduces that which has such agreeability as its subject or foundation. And because that can be found in any genus, at least in genera of absolutes, good is said to be converted with being not essentially but denominatively. Nevertheless, the formal nature of good is respective, namely, the aspect of agreeability. About that it should be observed that that which is agreeable to something or is agreeable to itself intrinsically, following the disposition of a material or formal cause, or as a quantitative part, like a foot or hand is agreeable to a human, or an essential part, like matter and form, and not even accidental perfections and by such formally and primarily are sufficient for the nature of good. Others, however, bring in agreeability to a thing extrinsically, following a disposition of an efficient cause or some other extrinsic nature or condition. And to such does the nature of good agree secondarily and extrinsically, just as health is called good primarily and formally. Medicine, however, and urine secondarily, because both extrinsically, one through the way of efficient [cause], the other through the way of a sign.

Dicendum ergo quod formalis ratio boni est convenientis, ita quod bonitas est formaliter ipsa convenientia, & contrahit entitatem ad partem subiectivam, quæ est relatio, & ad talem relationem quæ est convenientia, & sic omnis bonitas est quædam entitas, quæ est respectiva, sed non omnis entitas est quidditative bonitas, ita quod non convertuntur essentialiter bonum vero ratione concretionis importat id quod habet talem convenientiam ut eius subiectum vel fundamentum: & quia illud potest inveniri in quolibet genere, saltem in generibus absolutis, ideo bonum dicitur converti cum ente non essentialiter, sed denominative: formalis tamen ratio boni est respectiva, scilicet ratio convenientiæ. Circa quod notandum est quod illud quod est conveniens alicui, aut est ipsi conveniens intrinsece, secundum habitudinem causæ materialis vel formalis, vel sicut pars quantitativa, ut pes vel manus conveniunt homini, seu pars essentialis, ut materia, & forma, necnon & perfectiones accidentales & talibus formaliter & primo competit ratio boni, alia autem imporrant convenientiam ad rem extrinsece, secundum habitudinem causæ efficientis, vel alterius extrinsecæ rationis sive conditionis: & in talibus convenit secundo & extrinsece ratio boni, sicut sanitas dicitur bona primo & formaliter, medicina autem & urina secundo, quia utrunque extrinsece, unum per modum efficientis, aliud per modum signi.

23. Now it will be responded to the arguments. To the first through interemption of the major. For some relation expresses perfection, namely, the relation of agreeability. For perfection and perfectible express relations or dispositions. The things, moreover, to which

they fundamentally agree are certain absolutes, which is clear: for perfectible does not formally express [anything] except of some thing to another through which it has to be perfected. Nor does perfection express [anything] except a disposition of a thing to another, which through itself is perfected. Hence, perfectible and perfection are relations, but things to which such relations or dispositions agree as subjects or foundations are absolutes. And the same [is true] concerning goodness and good.

Nunc respondendum est ad rationes. Ad primum per interemptionem maioris. Aliqua enim relatio dicit perfectionem, scilicet relatio convenientis, perfectio enim & perfectibile dicunt relationes seu habitudines, res autem quibus hæc fundamentaliter conveniunt, sunt quædam absoluta, quod patet: perfectibile enim non dicit formaliter, nisi habitudinem alicuius rei ad aliam, per quam habet perfici, nec perfectio dicit nisi habitudinem rei ad aliam, quæ per ipsam perficitur: unde perfectibile & perfectio sunt relationes, sed res quibus tales rationes seu habitudines conveniunt tanquam subiectis vel fundamentis sunt absolutæ, & idem est de bonitate & bono.

24. To the second argument it should be responded through interemption of the minor, because it is impossible that something positive is converted essentially with being, except is is purely synonymous with it, just as has been shown.

Ad secundam rationem dicendum est per interemptionem minoris: quia impossibile est quod aliquid positivum convertatur essentialiter cum ente, nisi sit pure synonymum cum eo, sicut probatum fuit.

25. To the third likewise should be responded through interemption of the minor, because good [is] that which expresses formally, expresses as of something when one thing is called agreeable to another. And those who argue this say in the declaration of their position, because they say that good contracts being not to this but to of this and that entity is not goodness except as it is the perfection of something. And since it is shown that God is called good and just according to himself following the blessed Augustine in multiple locations in *De Trinitate*. It should be said that the blessed Augustine speaks concerning those things which are said absolute or relative so far as to the intrinsic things in divine things: for thus paternity and filiation and spiration are called relative in divine things, because they do not agree with all the persons which are constituted and distinguished by relations. Good, however, and just agree equally with each of the persons and therefore are not concerning intrinsic relations, but that they do not express an extrinsic relation to creatures the blessed Augustine never understood. That is clear because the blessed Augustine thus says concerning just, just as concerning good. But it is certain that good agrees with God relative to externals because justice is to another; not to another among the [divine] persons only, because the Father does not use justice to the Son or the Holy Spirit nor conversely. Therefore, to another in nature, that is, creatures. Therefore, etc.

Ad tertiam similiter dicendum est per interemptionem minoris, quia bonum illud quod dicit formaliter, dicit ut alicuius cum dicat convenientiam unius ad alterum.

Et istimet qui arguunt hoc dicunt in declaratione positionis sue, quia dicunt quod bonum contrahit ens non ad hoc, sed ad huius, & quod entitas non est bonitas, nisi ut est perfectio alicuius. Et cum probatur quod deus dicitur bonus & iustus ad se secundum beatum Aug. in pluribus locis de Tri. Dicendum quod beatus Aug. loquitur de illis qui dicuntur absolute vel relative quantum ad intrinseca in divinis: sic enim paternitas & filiatio & spiratio dicuntur relative in divinis: quia non conveniunt omnibus personis quæ constituuntur relationibus & distinguuntur: bonum autem & iustum æqualiter omnibus personis conveniunt, & ideo non sunt de relationibus intrinsecis, sed quod non dicant relationem extrinsecam ad creaturam numquam intellexit beatus Aug. quod patet, quia beatus Aug. ita loquitur de iusto, sicut de bono. constat autem quod iustum convenit deo relative ad extra quia iustitia est ad alterum: non ad alterum in persona solum, quia pater non utitur iustitia ad filium vel Spiritum sanctum, nec e converso, ergo ad alterum in natura, hoc est creatura, ergo etc.

26. To the fourth it should be said that the antecedent is false, because good in God expresses a relation or respect formally, not, indeed a respect to [something] within but to [something] without—evidently, to creatures. And when it is said that God is not really related to creatures, it should be said that just it was said in lib. I, dist. 30. If a relation is accepted for a respect through itself by consequence to the nature of the thing, thus God is not related to creatures. If, however, it is accepted for a real denomination taken up from many things, thus God is really related to creatures when he is called Creator or good. And that is placed under that was followed that God would be good from a disposition to creatures, and this his goodness would depend on creatures, it should be said that that is false. For it is a different thing to say that God is good in disposition to creatures and that his goodness depends on creatures. For the first is true, but the second is false. Rather, indeed, the goodness of creatures depends on God, and on account of this God is called good in disposition to creatures, because all creatures and whatever goodness and of perfection is in them depends on God.

Ad quartam dicendum quod antecedens est falsum, quia bonum in Deo dicit relationem vel respectum formaliter, non quidem respectum ad intra, sed ad extra, videlicet ad creaturas, & cum dicitur quod Deus non refertur realiter ad creaturas, dicendum est quod sicut dictum fuit. I. lib. dist. 30. Si relatio accipiatur pro respectu per se consequente ad naturam rei, Sic Deus non refertur ad creaturas. Si autem accipiatur pro realis denominatione sumpta ex pluribus, sic Deus refertur realiter ad creaturas cum dicitur creator vel bonus, & quod subditur quod sequeretur quod Deus esset bonus ex habitudine ad creaturas, & sic bonitas eius dependeret a creaturis, dicendum quod falsum est, aliud enim est Deum dici bonum in habitudine ad creaturas, & bonitatem eius dependere ad creaturas. Primum enim est verum, sed secundum est falsum: immo potius bonitas creaturæ dependet a Deo, & propter hoc Deus dicitur bonus in habitudine ad creaturam, quia tota creatura & quicquid bonitas²¹ & perfectionis est in ea

²¹...qa tota creatura & qcqd bonitas ...

dependet a Deo.

27. To the fifth it should be said that a respect alone does not move, but an absolute with a respect moves the practical intellect as much as the will. For a simple quiddity, although it can move the intellect to a simple act, which is intelligence of the indivisible, nevertheless it cannot move to a composite act unless received in a disposition to another. Because a composing act of understanding is considered in two [ways] on account of the agreeability of one thing to another, and thus the practical intellect is moved by the good insofar as it apprehends some absolute nature under the concept of agreeability to another.

Ad quintam dicendum quod solus respectus non movet, sed absolutum cum respectu movet tam intellectum practicum, quam voluntatem. Simplex enim quidditas, licet possit movere intellectum ad actum simplicem, qui est indivisibilium intelligentia, tamen non potest movere ad actum componentem, nisi accepta in habitu ad alterum: quia actus intelligendi componens fertur in duo propter convenientiam unius ad alterum, & sic intellectus practicus movetur a bono in quantum apprehendit aliquam naturam absolutam sub ratione convenientis ad alterum.