

The University of Akron

IdeaExchange@UAkron

---

Williams Honors College, Honors Research  
Projects

The Dr. Gary B. and Pamela S. Williams Honors  
College

---

Spring 2020

## St. Augustine and St. Thomas Aquinas on the Mind, Body, and Life After Death

Christopher Choma  
cjc170@zips.uakron.edu

Follow this and additional works at: [https://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/honors\\_research\\_projects](https://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/honors_research_projects)



Part of the [Christianity Commons](#), [Epistemology Commons](#), [European History Commons](#), [History of Philosophy Commons](#), [History of Religion Commons](#), [Metaphysics Commons](#), [Philosophy of Mind Commons](#), and the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

Please take a moment to share how this work helps you [through this survey](#). Your feedback will be important as we plan further development of our repository.

---

### Recommended Citation

Choma, Christopher, "St. Augustine and St. Thomas Aquinas on the Mind, Body, and Life After Death" (2020). *Williams Honors College, Honors Research Projects*. 1048.

[https://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/honors\\_research\\_projects/1048](https://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/honors_research_projects/1048)

This Dissertation/Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by The Dr. Gary B. and Pamela S. Williams Honors College at IdeaExchange@UAkron, the institutional repository of The University of Akron in Akron, Ohio, USA. It has been accepted for inclusion in Williams Honors College, Honors Research Projects by an authorized administrator of IdeaExchange@UAkron. For more information, please contact [mjon@uakron.edu](mailto:mjon@uakron.edu), [uapress@uakron.edu](mailto:uapress@uakron.edu).

**St. Augustine and St. Thomas Aquinas**  
**on the Mind, Body, and Life After Death**

**By: Christopher Choma**

**Sponsored by: Dr. Joseph Li Vecchi**

**Readers: Dr. Howard Ducharme**

**Dr. Nathan Blackerby**

## **Table of Contents**

<b><u>Introduction</u></b>	p. 4
<b><u>Section One: Three General Views of Human Nature</u></b>	p. 5
In this section, I will be discussing the various views on the nature of the relationship between the mind and the body. I find Augustine and Aquinas to agree that there is a connection between the mind and the body. Augustine's view can be classified as Platonic, while Aquinas's as Aristotelian.	
<b><u>Section Two: The Backgrounds of St. Augustine and St. Thomas Aquinas</u></b>	p. 7
In this section, I will be describing Augustine and Aquinas's respective histories, giving insight into their thought formation and views that informed their conclusions on the relationship between the mind and the body.	
<b>Subsection A: Augustine's Formation</b>	p. 7
Augustine's influences are varied, with influences being drawn from Plato, Plotinus, Christianity, and many others.	
<b>Subsection B: Aquinas's Formation</b>	p. 9
Aquinas's influences are mainly from his mentor, St. Albert the Great, Christianity, and Aristotle.	
<b><u>Section Three: Augustine and Aquinas on the Body, Soul, and Mortality</u></b>	p. 11
In this section, I will be engaging in an extensive analysis of Augustine and Aquinas's views of the relationship between the mind and the body	
<b>Subsection A: Augustine and the Neoplatonists on the Body</b>	p. 11
In this section, I analyze the influence of Plotinus and the Neoplatonic tradition on Augustine's view of the body.	
<b>Subsection B: Augustine on the Soul</b>	p. 17
In this section, I analyze Augustine's conclusions regarding the soul, which are heavily informed by his Christianity.	
<b>Subsection C: Augustine on the Resurrection</b>	p. 20
In this section, I analyze Augustine's theological and philosophical thoughts regarding the Christian doctrine of bodily resurrection	
<b>Subsection D: Thomas Aquinas's Views of the Body and Soul</b>	Pg. 21
In this section, I explicate Aquinas's views on the body and the soul, and how	

Aristotelian metaphysics played an important part in his thought formation, particularly regarding hylomorphism.

**Section Four: Comparing and Contrasting Augustine and Aquinas**

p. 26

In this final section, I will be comparing and contrasting the viewpoints of two of philosophy's greatest Christian thinkers. I hope to demonstrate how similar, yet different the two philosophers are in regards to their final conclusions on the nature of the mind and the body. I have found Aquinas's perspective to be more demonstratively compelling than Augustine's, yet believe Augustine's perspective to be invaluable to the field of Christian mysticism.

**Bibliography**

p. 29

**Introduction:**

Two of philosophy's most prominent Christian thinkers are St. Augustine of Hippo and St. Thomas Aquinas. While one would assume their views on the nature of the mind and the body are primarily informed by their adherence to Christian principles, there are slight differences in the formulations and conclusions found within their respective works that give an indication of some of their divergent philosophical commitments. In this paper, it is my goal to show the similarities and differences between the two by tracing their philosophical developments and I will examine how their influences inform their ideas regarding the nature of the mind and the body, and what they believe happens after we die.

St. Augustine's philosophical reflections on the nature of the mind and body begin with his realization of the intuitive undeniability of the personal mind, an inductive realization of the thinking self, and a diminished view of the physical body. This point marks the beginning of a critical debate within Augustinian philosophy. Many scholars believe that St. Augustine derived his ideas on the relationship between the mind and the body strictly from theological doctrine. Others argue that he employs Platonic and Neoplatonic epistemological and ontological principles to arrive at definitions of the immaterial mind, the material body, and the survival of the self after death. I will attempt to find a middle ground between the two schools of thought.

St. Thomas Aquinas's philosophical investigations likely started when he was an oblate at the Benedictan Monastery of Montecassino at the age of five.<sup>1</sup> His theological and philosophical studies continued when he joined the Dominican Order at the University of Paris, where he was taken as a pupil by St. Albert the Great. Upon completing his studies, under the guidance of St. Albert, it was Aquinas's goal to employ Aristotle's metaphysics and psychology

---

<sup>1</sup>Kennedy, Daniel. "St. Thomas Aquinas." *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. Vol. 14. New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1912. 30 Mar. 2020

as a means to further explain Christian doctrine. This was a radical departure from tradition, since Aristotle had originally been seen in opposition to the prevalent Augustinian metaphysics of the Church, with its roots in Platonism<sup>2</sup>. By combining Aristotelian metaphysics and Christian doctrine, Aquinas impacted Christian theology and philosophy with his work that continues to be studied. I will be investigating how Aquinas uses Aristotelian and Christian metaphysics to come to his doctrine regarding the survival of the self after bodily death.

### **Section One: Three General Views of Human Nature**

The main philosophical claim being examined in this paper is whether the mind requires the body to persist in its existence. In this section, I will be discussing three perspectives that attempt to give an explanation of the relationship of the mind and the body.

*Physicalism.* Physicalism generally holds that everything is the result of physical and scientifically measurable processes. This view holds that every reality has a material cause, including the mind, being a byproduct of these physical processes.<sup>3</sup> Under this view, it follows that religion, spirituality, and the prospect of an afterlife are nothing but demonstrably false descriptions of realities. The body is viewed as a machine, and the soul is viewed as either non-existent or an epiphenomenon of the body. This view has not sufficiently explained reality, and holds no bearing on the topic at hand, since neither Augustine or Aquinas subscribe to it. Therefore, the position will not be treated here.

The second view sees the mind as a form that is trapped within a corporeal body, or what I will refer to as the “Platonic Conception of the Body and Mind”. This view was first brought to

---

<sup>2</sup> Führer, Markus, "Albert the Great", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Summer 2019 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.)

<sup>3</sup> Stoljar, Daniel, "Physicalism", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2017 Edition)

the forefront of western philosophy by Plato in his work, *Phaedo*.<sup>4</sup> In this work, Plato seeks to have others understand his reasons for believing in the immortality of the soul, or mind. He believed, because of our unchanging natures, forms are the foundation of reality. Plato relegates the material world to illusory appearance at best, depending upon the forms for its reality. The mind is trapped inside a corporeal being which kept it from fully engaging with the realm of the Forms.<sup>5</sup> Because our bodies are restricted to a material world, we cannot fully interact with the forms until our souls, or minds, are free from their corporeal counterparts.

In Plato's view, while the body is not the immediate foundation of reality, it prompts the imprisoned soul to engage with the immaterial reality, when through the material senses, we become aware of the forms. Augustine tends to sympathize with this view, most likely due to his Neoplatonic sympathies and desire to know his inner being by focusing his attention internally, away from the material world. However, because of Augustine's habit of mixing Neoplatonism with Christian doctrine, his view of the body and the mind differs from standard Christian thought.

The third view takes the substantial unity of the human being and further distinguishes two aspects which we refer to as mind and body. These are inseparable as form and matter in this life. I refer to this view as the "Aristotelian Conception of the Mind and Body". This view is held by Aristotelians, such as St. Thomas Aquinas, who believed that experience of the sensory world is the beginning of all knowledge, including knowledge of immaterial reality. Conflict arises within this view regarding the Christian doctrine of the separated soul. Below, I will examine how Aquinas is able to get around this issue.

---

<sup>4</sup> Robinson, Howard, "Dualism", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2017 Edition), Edward N. Zalta

<sup>5</sup> Ibid 1

Setting out the three views of human nature allows the reader to notice how similar, and yet how different they are from one another. Augustine and Aquinas were by no means opposites when it came to their views on the mind and body, which is quite interesting, since the schools of philosophy they respectively aligned themselves with are in conflict with one another. I will now discuss the origins of the two men and how their philosophical views came to surface.

## **Section Two: The Backgrounds of St. Augustine and St. Thomas Aquinas**

### **A) Augustine's Formation**

It's important to note the various shifts in St. Augustine's thought, because many of his former philosophical positions influenced what would later become his Christian theology and philosophy, and, in particular, his views on the nature of the human being. His thought can be traced as moving from a form of hedonism linked to his later doctrine of Original Sin, to Manichean dualism, Academic Skepticism, strict Neoplatonism, and then finally to Christian Neoplatonism.

From the time of his early adolescence, St. Augustine of Hippo was immersed in hedonistic pleasure, which he later came to view as sin. When Augustine discusses his upbringing, he is hesitant, as all he correlates with his youth is the corruption of the life that God had given him. Augustine provides evidence showing that his desires were set on selfish things, such as sex for pleasure or stealing a pear from a peartree for the sheer thrill of being evil.<sup>6</sup> These

---

<sup>6</sup> Augustine, *Confessions*, Translated by J.G. Pilkington, From *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, First Series*, Vol. 1. Edited by Philip Schaff. (Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1887.) Revised and edited for New Advent by Kevin Knight., Book II, Chapter 6, Section 12.  
 "For, having plucked them, I threw them away, my sole gratification in them being my own sin, which I was pleased to enjoy."



were things that only deterred him further from God. It was only later that he recognized these feelings of shame came from his God-gifted morality.

The first shift in Augustine's thought came with his acceptance of Manichæan Dualism. Manichæism is considered to be a Gnostic Christian sect.<sup>7</sup> The founder of Manichæism was the prophet Mani (216-274 A.D.).<sup>8</sup> Mani believed that he was the last prophet and apostle to Jesus Christ.<sup>9</sup> Manichæans believed in a cosmic duality that viewed Good and Evil in a constant battle with one another. This expressed itself as matter and spirit, or body and soul. They also believed that God and Satan were in constant battle between one another, something deemed heretical by Christians.<sup>10</sup> Augustine spent nine years studying under the Manicheans until he started separating the Manichæan's diction from their actual beliefs, stating "I'd learned that a statement isn't true for the sole reason that its expression is unrefined, or false merely because its style is superb."<sup>11</sup> After trying to mentor Faustus, a member of his sect of Manichæism, on literature, Augustine decided that the man's views blocked him from distinguishing their actual beliefs from true knowledge about much of anything. This prompted Augustine to be rid of his desires to ever advance in his sect's ranks, and to set sail for Rome, as a teacher of rhetoric. At Rome, his desire for truth reignited.

Upon his arrival in Rome, Augustine became acquainted with the thought of the Academicians, stating, "The Academics had been shrewder than all the others, because they'd expressed the view that everything should be doubted, and they'd determined that no part of truth

---

<sup>7</sup> Arendzen, John. "Manichæism." *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. Vol. 9. New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1910. 9 Mar. 2020

<sup>8</sup> Encyclopædia Britannica, *Mani*, Added by contributors, April 10, 2020

<sup>9</sup> Ibid 1

<sup>10</sup> New World Encyclopedia contributors, "Manichæism," *New World Encyclopedia*,

<sup>11</sup> Augustine, *Confessions*, Translated by Sarah Ruden, The Modern Library, 2018, Book 5, pg. 115

could be grasped by humankind.”<sup>12</sup> Augustine eventually refuted his view of the Academics, as he came to the conclusion that their judgement that we cannot know any truth was, itself, a judgment that the Academicians held to be true. This was a contradiction to the core belief of the Academics.

A very important aspect of Augustine’s thoughts on the mind and the body come from his refutation of the Academicians. In regards to their notion that everything should be doubted, Augustine was able to come up with a counterargument that effectively proved the existence of his mental activity. Augustine stated that if there is someone there to doubt something or other, there must be an existent subject engaging in the act of doubting. He realized that since he was the subject doubting, he must exist.<sup>13</sup> While still agnostic regarding his views of the importance and value of the body, Augustine was now able to inductively conceive of the existence of the mind.

After his rejection of Academic Skepticism, Augustine began to read the works of the Neoplatonists, adopting Neoplatonism shortly before being converted into the Christian faith. It seems that Augustine was drawn to Neoplatonism by rigorous study of Plotinus’s *Enneads*.<sup>14</sup> At the same time as these studies, Augustine had a famous paradigm shift after reflecting upon the truth of Christianity while sitting in a garden located in Milan. Since there is no discussion of Augustine ever dismissing his Neoplatonic sympathies, it is assumed that he carried them along with him during his conversion.

## **B) Aquinas’s Formation**

---

<sup>12</sup> Ibid Book 5, pg. 127

<sup>13</sup> Watson, Gerard. "“I Doubt, Therefore I Am”: St. Augustine and Scepticism." *The Maynooth Review / Revieú Mhá Nuad* 12 (1985): 42-50

<sup>14</sup> Mendelson, Michael, “Saint Augustine,” *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2010 Edition), Section 6.1

St. Thomas Aquinas's progression of thought is perhaps not as colorful as Augustine's. His main influence within philosophy was Aristotle, and his mentor, Albert the Great. Aristotle was finding a resurgence in the Latin-speaking world in the 13th century due to the commentary done on his works by Avicenna, Averroes, and other Muslim and Christian thinkers. These commentaries found their way to the University of Paris and Cologne, where Aquinas was to finish his studies in theology and philosophy after studying under St. Albert the Great.<sup>15</sup>

Albert the Great was one of the first philosophers to bring Aristotelianism into Christian thought. He saw Aristotle as an authority regarding matters of natural science, which were based on observation and experimentation. He saw Christian revelation and the Bible as authorities regarding divine matters. These two, Albert concluded, were not opposed to one another.<sup>16</sup> This synthesis of the two methodologies would heavily influence Aquinas.

One of Aristotle's most prominent doctrines that Aquinas took to was hylomorphism, or that physical objects are the composite of form and matter.<sup>17</sup> Hylomorphism allows for there to be a synthesis between the corporeal and incorporeal, or better, to see them as inseparable from one another. Matter is what allows unchanging form to exist in the material world that is constantly changing. In order to know and differentiate physical objects, we must abstract their form from the matter in the process of cognition. Concerning the separated form, once separated from matter, we are able to distinguish its "being" and "essence", which respectively tell the subject what the thing is and that the thing is. This view informs Aquinas's views of the soul and its relationship with the body, particularly how both are necessary for the existence and intelligibility of the human being.

---

<sup>15</sup> Christopher M. Brown, *Thomas Aquinas*, Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy

<sup>16</sup> Führer, Markus, "Albert the Great"

<sup>17</sup> Ainsworth, Thomas, "Form vs. Matter", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Spring 2016 Edition)

Initially, some Christian theologians found Aristotle's works to include heretical views. Albert and Aquinas, however, were seemingly unphased by these claims. They were more interested in the methodology of Aristotle and how the formation of his thoughts were methodical, yet also common sense.<sup>18</sup> Due to his interest in theology and Aristotle, Aquinas is, to a great degree, responsible for the rehabilitation of Aristotle in Western thought. Just like Aristotle, he was set on vindicating the status of the material world, which had been continuously relegated by previous thinkers to secondary importance. These thinkers opted to view the material world as a barrier to interaction with the incorporeal world, or the true reality found in the writings of philosophers such as Plato. Aquinas took what he learned from his mentor Albert the Great and applied it to metaphysics and psychology.

Nevertheless, many Christian thinkers held closely to the Platonic and Neoplatonic traditions, which conflict with aspects of Aristotelian thought. Platonists view the body as a vehicle for the mind and soul, whilst Aristotelians believe more robustly in the reality of both the material as well as immaterial worlds. Given Augustine was heavily borrowing from Plato and Plotinus, and Aquinas from Aristotle and St. Albert the Great, one can see that their views of Christianity and the relationship between the mind and the body are bound to differ.

### **Section Three: Augustine and Aquinas on the Body, Soul, and Morality**

#### **A) Augustine and the Neoplatonists on the Body**

In order to understand Augustine's view of the body, it is necessary to first understand Neoplatonic ontology. In particular, it is important to consider his views after his conversion to Christianity, how this ontology influences his understanding of Christianity. I will be engaging

---

<sup>18</sup> Brown 1

with two articles, insofar as they treat Plotinus, who was monumental in the formation of Augustine's ontology and metaphysics

Plotinus (204-270 A.D.) is a third-century Platonic philosopher and the founder of the Neoplatonic tradition.<sup>19</sup> While studying Aristotelian metaphysics at the Library of Alexandria, Plotinus learned of Aristotle's Unmoved Mover, which was coeternal with the Heavens, or Cosmos. Plotinus believed that, logically, there must be a singular first cause that causes itself, and that nothing else can be said about it, as that would change it from being a perfectly simple unity to having some sort of abilities that require a distinction, indicating potentiality and not pure actuality. In Aristotle, the Unmoved Mover creates by reflecting upon itself. If a being reflects, there is a distinction being made between the being and the thing it is reflecting on. Therefore, Plotinus says that Aristotle's Unmoved Mover is not a true first cause, as a true first cause has no distinguishable characteristics besides its simplicity. So, Plotinus views the One, and not Aristotle's Unmoved Mover, as a true first cause.<sup>20</sup> This first cause is akin to the one Augustine adopts, with some minor discrepancies as a result of his conversion to Christianity.

Many scholars will argue that Augustine views the body negatively, with much of his theological views of the body describing it as corrupted, or incomplete in some manner.<sup>21</sup> This is due to the Neoplatonists, such as Plotinus and Porphyry, who held that the body kept the soul from fully uniting with the One, and that this privation was evil.<sup>22</sup> They defined evil as some privation which kept one from contemplating the One, or God, the highest source of truth, actuality, and illumination.<sup>23</sup> They associated acts that were ontologically less perfect and more

---

<sup>19</sup>Gerson, Lloyd, "Plotinus", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2018 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.)

<sup>20</sup> Stanford, Plotinus 1

<sup>21</sup> Dera Sipe. Soul/Body Dualism in Porphyry and Augustine. Villanova University. 2006

<sup>22</sup> Holoduek Jr, John Charles. "The Philosophy of Neoplatonism and Its Effects on the Thought of St. Augustine of Hippo." *Dialogue: Journal of Phi Sigma Tau* 55, no. 2-3 (April 1, 2013): 136-57. pg. 153

<sup>23</sup> Sipe pg. 11

potential as corruptible, and therefore, less good when compared to the One. The Neoplatonists believed within their ontology that every being is emanated from a perfect unity, the One, which is, by itself, unknowable, except for its divine simplicity via negative theology, or things we can say that it is not.<sup>24</sup> From a Neoplatonist point of view, it is because of the One that there is something rather than nothing, and reflection on the nature of the One is the greatest use of the intellect.

The things that are emanated from The One are called Intellect (or Nous). They are the summation of all the objects of cognition that make knowledge possible.<sup>25</sup> Emanation is a process in which the One produces Intellect by a “spontaneous and necessary efflux of power.”<sup>26</sup> These beings emanated from the one are not as actualized as The One, and are able to be reflected upon due to their potency. It is necessary that the Forms require a first cause, as without them, Plotinus believes there would be disunity, and disunity would make it impossible for true knowledge to be grasped.

After the emanation of Nous is the Soul, which is the desire of the things that are external to the agent of desire.<sup>27</sup> This is a principle that Augustine borrowed for his discussion of the inner self. These things include humans, animals, and plants. According to Plotinus, who derived this idea from Aristotle, humans are the only beings within this group with immaterial souls, as they are able and desire to engage in self-reflection and abstraction while plants and animals are limited to solely nutritive, or nutritive and sensory powers, respectively.<sup>28</sup> The most desirable thing for a being with an intellect is to contemplate the One, as it is the being of

---

<sup>24</sup> Sipe pg.11

<sup>25</sup> Gerson, Lloyd, "Plotinus"

<sup>26</sup> Armstrong, A. H. "'Emanation' in Plotinus." *Mind* 46, no. 181 (1937): 61-66.

<sup>27</sup> Gerson 1

<sup>28</sup> Ibid 1

greatest actuality, and the things emanated from its desire for a reconnection. Plotinus believed that through arduous contemplation, an intellectual being had the ability to gain contact with The One, but unlike Christians, Neoplatonists did not believe that a being whose existence is beyond being could form a relationship with its genera.<sup>29</sup>

This Neoplatonic ontology was influential to Augustine, as it shaped how he viewed the body and evil as a privation. Since human beings are afflicted with corporeal desires, these desires can deter one from engaging with the One. For example: Augustine's sexual desires would be considered evil in Neoplatonic thought because they shift his attention away from the contemplation of the One to other potential bodies which were slowly corrupting and unable to, themselves, achieve perfection.<sup>30</sup>

However, the Neoplatonic view conflicted with the Manicheans' view of the body which Augustine had previously adopted. The Manicheans believed that evil was an actual substance in constant battle with good. The Neoplatonists viewed evil as nothing but a turning of the will away from God.<sup>31</sup> Evil, to Plotinus, is a condition that comes along with existing in the physical world. Bodies are plagued by desires that turn one away from exercising their intellect.

Augustine himself believes that there are three levels of reality: the lowest level, the second level, and the highest nature.<sup>32</sup> These levels can be placed based on their potency and their actuality. The body, holding the most potency and least actuality, would be considered the furthest from the pure actuality that is The One. This is why Augustine as a Neoplatonist holds that the body is nothing but a vessel for the soul, which is the second level of reality. The soul is a separate substance from the body, but is posited through the entirety of the body's extension.

---

<sup>29</sup> Ibid 1, section 2

<sup>30</sup> Sipes 12

<sup>31</sup> Ibid 11

<sup>32</sup> Holoduek pg. 152

Since the soul is bound to the material world, it deals with both the natural and immaterial via the act of cognition. This is an Aristotelian concept. The soul comes to know a thing in the material world with its body's sense organs. The form found within the substance's matter is then captured by the intellectual soul, dematerialized and turned into real knowledge. So, the soul has both proportionate levels of contact with the material and immaterial realms.<sup>33</sup> The highest level of reality is God, which the soul yearns to make contact with. As previously stated, the Neoplatonists believed this could be achieved through contemplation, pushing past the limits of reason imposed by the material body, and would allow for a very brief, impersonal connection with God. However, Augustine believed that a personal relationship with God could be attained, and this is where his thought started diverging from the Neoplatonists.<sup>34</sup>

Augustine realized there are some commitments within Neoplatonism that are not compatible with Christianity. The Neoplatonists, holding that there are desires that keep the body from experiencing God to its full capacity, wouldn't see the possibility of there being a man who was fully God, yet also trapped within the human body. So, the Christian doctrine of Jesus Christ as fully man and fully human conflicts with Neoplatonic ontology. Jesus's nature, in Neoplatonism, is contradictory. By being God, His essence is infinite, but by being human, His essence is "finite".<sup>35</sup> By becoming flesh, God would be existing in the realm of being, meaning that his perfection was limited by the necessity that is contingent on existing (the Neoplatonists held that God was beyond existence). Augustine desired a more personal God. Unlike the Neoplatonists, whose focus was on contemplation in order to break the barriers of the body, Augustine sought contact with God through prayer and inward spiritual reflection.<sup>36</sup> So, in

---

<sup>33</sup> Ibid pg. 152

<sup>34</sup> Ibid pg, 152

<sup>35</sup> Holoduek pg. 153

<sup>36</sup> Ibid pg. 153



regards to his ontological commitments, Augustine, through an act of inward reflection, stands firm in his belief that Jesus Christ is both God and Man and personally knowable.

Augustine, after his conversion to Christianity, no longer viewed the body as a mere vessel from which the soul operates. The two substances (body and soul) do not mix, meaning that they have the capacity to be separate from one another. Augustine also commented on the evil tendencies of the body. He saw it as a privation of good, with “good” philosophically meaning “to be”, or having being. Substances that were subject to privations, therefore, were less actualized than acts that were not.<sup>37</sup> By adopting this conception of evil, Augustine did not have to state that God was the reason why evil exists in the world. Since evil is not a substance, it is a privation of good. God only creates being, and to be is good. God does not create evil in the world, as everything God creates is good.<sup>38</sup>

This is a definition that Augustine subscribed to, as it fit very closely with the concept of sin in the Christian tradition. Augustine believed that the privation that is evil also expresses itself in the world as a consequence of human persons having the capacity for free will.<sup>39</sup> While still being bound by their bodies, humans have the capacity to come to know truth through the use of their will. Augustine believed that a human living up to their full capabilities would use this free will to turn their attention to spiritual matters instead of bodily matters.<sup>40</sup> Because of the ability to introspect and encounter God through a movement of the will, Augustine did not believe that the soul was “trapped” within the body<sup>41</sup>. Instead of following the Platonic thought, which held that our cognitive capabilities were restricted due to the body, Augustine held that

---

<sup>37</sup> Ibid pg. 154

<sup>38</sup> Ibid pg. 155

<sup>39</sup> Howard Rachlin, *The Escape of the Mind*, Oxford University Press, 2014, pg, 28

<sup>40</sup> Rachlin pg. 28

<sup>41</sup> Ibid pg. 31

this restriction is solely a lack of motivation to look inward and find the truth. This general disregard for looking inward is a natural condition of our bodily desires, which tend to distract intellectual beings from their pursuits. Augustine held that the highest truth, while located within each person's respective soul, is identical for every person.<sup>42</sup> There is one source of the truth that dwells inside each person, which Augustine claims is God.

So, what exactly is looking inward? Augustine held that human beings can only logically comprehend the enormity of the divine in terms of extension and metaphor.<sup>43</sup> Since God is incorporeal, and our logic cannot grasp all of the immaterial, how is one to understand His nature? Augustine believed that this is where inner reflection on the soul becomes necessary.

### **B) Augustine on the Soul:**

Instead of allowing our senses to dictate our idea of the divine, Augustine believes that turning towards another incorporeal entity, namely the soul, will give us the closest thing we can find to God. In Book Seven of *Confessions*, Augustine says, "for though a human being, in keeping with his more inward humanity, delights in God's law, what will he do about the other law, in his body, which is at war with the law of his mind and leads him captive under the law of sin?"<sup>44</sup> While one is able to reach God through soul, their body is still subjected to its natural state dictated by the Law of Sin.

Augustine believes that even though the ability to look inward is interrupted by bodily distractions, this wretchedness is conquered by Jesus Christ. He says that "because he won over our will to resemble his own", humans coming to know Christ as their saviour through inward

---

<sup>42</sup> Ibid pg. 31

<sup>43</sup> Philip Cary, *Augustine's Invention of the Inner Self: The Legacy of a Christian Platonist*, John Hopkins University Press, 2001, pg. 64

<sup>44</sup> Ruden pg. 201

reflection, in spite of all the struggles that come along with the material world, will reveal to them the true omnipotence that is God.<sup>45</sup> Augustine says it is “one thing to see from a wooded mountain-top the country of peace, but not to find a way there, and to struggle through a trackless wilderness, while blocked and attacked and stalked from all sides by deserters on the run, with their leader the lion and the dragon.”<sup>46</sup>

Augustine believed that the body and its various distractions were a barrier to the divine, but did not make it impossible to reach God. While the Neoplatonists held that the divine lies in intellectual pursuits, Augustine held that it could be found by overcoming privations set upon the body, and focusing inwardly. By looking inward at one’s soul, stripping themselves of bodily temptations, and eventually recognizing that each person contains God, one could finally come to understand the nature of God.<sup>47</sup> The body is not merely a vessel, but a means to exercise the will, and to engage with their inner self. That makes the body and the soul both good.

Can this incorporeal soul that Augustine reflects upon survive the death of its seemingly contingent body? Augustine’s answer is, of course, yes. The soul’s fixation with sensible objects is merely a condition set upon it by the material body. The mind itself, divorced from its engagement with sensible objects, requires no external object to recognize its own existence, as its only act is thinking, which can be done even if nothing material exists. One does not need to engage with sensible substances in the material world to reflect on the undeniability that they are experiencing awareness at its root.

---

<sup>45</sup> Ibid pg. 201

<sup>46</sup> Ibid pg. 202

<sup>47</sup> Ruden, *Confessions*, pg. 286

“The universe is a physical mass, smaller in any part than in the whole. But *you*, my soul, are automatically better than that, I’m telling you, because you give energy to the mass of my body, giving it life, which no material object can do for another one. But your God is the life of your life.”

To further support my view on Augustine's self-reflexivity of the mind, I look to another one of Augustine's works. In *On the Trinity*, Augustine states,

“Nothing is at all rightly said to be known while its substance is not known. And therefore, when the mind knows itself, it knows its own substance; and when it is certain about itself, it is certain about its own substance. But it is certain about itself, as those things which are said above prove convincingly; although it is not at all certain whether itself is air, or fire, or some body, or some function of body.”<sup>48</sup>

The mind, which is incorporeal, has the ability to know itself. Augustine also states in Book X of his *Confessions*, “However, the *mind* claims the word *cogito* as its exclusive property, as nothing that's collected together - or in other words driven together - in the mind is at this stage of the language properly said to be “thought of”.<sup>49</sup> In this passage, Augustine seems to be referring to the mind's exclusive action as the pondering of itself. So, if the mind itself is incorporeal, and its distinctive action is self-reflexive thought, it must follow that it can survive the death of the material body.

The essence of the mind is thought itself, which is incorporeal in nature. The mind's reflection on itself, its self-reflexive thought, is immaterial and does not corrupt as the body does because, before reflecting on any sensible object, the mind must first realize itself.<sup>50</sup> Before anyone thinks, they apprehend that there is a subject engaging in the thinking (the “I”). So, for Augustine, since the mind's essence is incorporeal, the cessation of life in corporeal beings at death has no effect on the soul.

---

<sup>48</sup> Augustine, *On the Trinity*, Translated by Arthur West Haddan. From Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, First Series, Vol. 3. Edited by Philip Schaff. (Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1887.) Revised and edited for New Advent by Kevin Knight. Book 1, Chapter 10.

<sup>49</sup> Ruden, *Confessions*, pg. 294

<sup>50</sup> Christian Tornau, “St. Augustine”, Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 2019, Section 6.2, paraphrase of position, which itself is an interpretation

### C) Augustine on the Resurrection

Augustine holds that both the body and the soul are necessary for the Christian doctrine of the Resurrection during the Second Coming of Jesus Christ. He believes that there are two resurrections: one occurs right after death, and another that occurs during the Second Coming, prophesied in the Book of Revelations. The first resurrection deals with the soul's ascension, with nothing corporeal being affected. It is only possible to experience this resurrection only during life. All souls, except for Jesus Christ's, are considered to be dead in sin. In Book XX of *City of God*, Augustine states,

“For all the dead there died the one only person who lived, that is, who had no sin whatever, in order that they who live by the remission of their sins should live, not to themselves, but to Him who died for all, for our sins, and rose again for our justification, that we, believing in Him who justifies the ungodly, and being justified from ungodliness or quickened from death, may be able to attain to the first resurrection which now is.”<sup>51</sup>

So, by reflecting upon the aforementioned inner life and accepting Jesus Christ (through baptism), Augustine believes that the soul is risen by the Savior, and this resurrection is one of mercy for believers.

The second resurrection has to do with the body proper. Augustine says that this resurrection has nothing to do with belief and is more concerned with the judgement of the acts of both believers and non-believers. Augustine, referencing the Bible, believes that, by the lives led by the inhabitants of these bodies, Christ will determine whether they ascend to Heaven or

---

<sup>51</sup> Augustine, *City of God*, Book XX, Translated by Marcus Dods. From Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, First Series, Vol. 2. Edited by Philip Schaff. (Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1887.) Revised and edited for New Advent by Kevin Knight.

descend to Hell<sup>52</sup>. As said earlier, Augustine believed evil to be a lack of focus on God. With this in mind, it seems that those who were enslaved by their bodily desires, and ignore their spiritual desires, are more likely to endure damnation, while those who focused on the inner life and stripped themselves away from their bodily desires are more likely to inhabit Heaven.

It is easily seen that Augustine mixes the Neoplatonic conception of evil with Christianity in order to provide an account for what happens to the body and the soul after death. If it were not for the Neoplatonists, Augustine's views on the nature of the body would not have formulated the way they did. Instead of seeing the body as pure sin as the Manicheans had, Augustine came to see it as a means to contemplate and interact with God, which is the highest good for an intellectual being. In regards to the soul, Augustine recognized the undeniability of the mind as an incorporeal substance, later determining through the help of Christian doctrine what happens to this substance after bodily death. As someone who developed ideas from Neoplatonism and Christianity, Augustine is firmly described as a Neoplatonic Christian.

#### **D) Thomas Aquinas's Views of the Body and Soul**

Before discussing Thomas Aquinas, one must understand the concept of hylomorphism as applied in Aristotle's psychology, expounded upon in *De Anima*. Aristotle holds that all things in the knowable world are a composite of form and matter.<sup>53</sup> For example: an acorn would be composed of two things, form, consisting of being and acorn-ness, and matter. Aristotle applies the hylomorphic distinction to living things in *De Anima*, stating, "That is why the soul is the first grade of actuality of a natural body having life potentially in it."<sup>54</sup> For humans, the soul is

---

<sup>52</sup> Matthew 25:41: "Then he will say to those on his left, 'Depart from me, you who are cursed, into the eternal fire prepared for the devil and his angels.'" NIV

<sup>53</sup> Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, Book 8, Chapter 6,

<sup>54</sup> Aristotle, *De Anima*, Based on the translation by E. M. Edghill, with minor emendations by Daniel Kolak.pg. 15

the form, and the body is the matter. He goes on to describe a variety of different hylomorphic beings, stating, “the body corresponds to what exists in potentiality; as the pupil plus the power of sight constitutes the eye, so the soul plus the body constitutes the animal.”<sup>55</sup> It is from the soul that the body gets its design. Without the soul, there would be nothing giving life to a material body. Conversely, the soul without the body cannot exist in the material world. For example: the power of sight would be useless without it actualizing the pupil. Using an Aristotelian framework then, the soul would not be able to exist without it being the actuality of a body, which is a point that Aquinas is going to expound upon in his *Summa theologiae* and his commentary on Aristotle’s *De Anima*.

Hylomorphism has been plagued by misunderstanding throughout the history of philosophy. First, it seems to view the body and the soul as two entities that are physically separable. This view is mistaken. That would give the impression that the soul can, of itself, present in the material world, because separability implies materiality. So, when discussing the soul and the body, it is difficult to describe the two being made distinct without inadvertently committing to the notion that the soul is ontologically separable from the body. Aquinas fights this problem by noting that the physical body takes the form dictated to it by the soul, and not vice versa.

Aquinas adopts from Aristotle his viewpoint on the soul, stating that “the soul is defined as the first principle of life of those things which live: for we call living things ‘animate’, [i.e. having a soul], and those things which have no life, ‘inanimate’.”<sup>56</sup> Along with this definition, Aquinas holds that there is no possibility for a body to be the first principle of life, as nothing

---

<sup>55</sup> Ibid pg. 15

<sup>56</sup> *The Summa Theologiae of St. Thomas Aquinas*, Second and Revised Edition, 1920, Literally translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province, First Part, Question 75, Article 1

corporeal has the ability to be so. For Aquinas, the soul is what actualizes the body, but both are equally necessary, as they constitute a human being. In his *Summa theologiae*, Aquinas writes, “For as it belongs to the notion of this particular man to be composed of this soul, of this flesh, and of these bones; so it belongs to the notion of man to be composed of soul, flesh, and bones; for whatever belongs in common to the substance of all the individuals contained under a given species, must belong to the substance of the species.”<sup>57</sup> The essence of a human being is composed of body and soul. While the human form actualizes a human being and dictates what traits a thing has that makes it a human being, its matter allows the form to be present in and interact with the natural world through various sensory faculties. When separated from the body, the soul could not exist in the natural world.

Aquinas then explains how the soul takes the form of the body. Augustine, by contrast, does not address this. Aquinas insists that the form refers to the specific flesh and bone. The soul is separated from the body at death materially, but there is no complete separation formally, and therefore, form is more closely tied to material than in Augustine’s conception. Form always contains notes referring to specific matter. The essence dictates what a human being is supposed to be composed of when actualized in the natural world. It is because of form that the human being has its particular bodily nature.

Aquinas discusses how the soul, nonetheless, is something that is separable from the body. In the *Summa theologiae*, he states, “For it is clear that by means of the intellect, man can have knowledge of all corporeal things. Now whatever knows certain things cannot have any of them in its own nature; because that which is in it naturally would impede the knowledge of anything else.”<sup>58</sup> Aquinas is stating that if what receives knowledge was something corporeal,

---

<sup>57</sup> *The Summa Theologiae of St. Thomas Aquinas*, First Part, Question 75, Article 4.

<sup>58</sup> *Ibid*, First Part, Question 75, Article 1



everything that we could know would only be seen through the lens of that particular kind of corporeal thing. It could not have knowledge of things divorced from its nature. While the corporeal parts of the body are necessary for the experiencing of the natural world, they are not an organ of knowledge, as knowledge is not conditioned by any particular.

Aquinas then tackles the question of whether or not the human soul separated from the body is, itself, made out of matter, or if it contains within it something corporeal, as a body does. He states that it is not the soul that takes the shape of the body, but the body that materializes and takes the shape dictated by the soul. He states,

“For if the intellectual soul were composed of matter and form, the forms of things would be received into it as individuals, and so it would only know the individual: just as it happens with the sensitive powers which receive forms in a corporeal organ; since matter is the principle by which forms are individualized. It follows, therefore, that the intellectual soul, and every intellectual substance which has knowledge of forms absolutely, is exempt from composition of matter and form.”<sup>59</sup>

If one were to say that the soul is a material being, then it would be bound by some type of potentiality that coincides with forms that are actualized in matter. However, for something to be pure actuality, it must have no potentiality, and therefore no corporeality. This makes the actualizing aspect of the soul pure potentiality with the ability to receive the form based upon its mode of reception.

Aquinas compares the body and the soul to a source of heat and the actual heat. He states, “Therefore the soul, which is the first principle of life, is not a body, but the act of a body; thus heat, which is the principle of calefaction, is not a body, but an act of a body.”<sup>60</sup> As described by

---

<sup>59</sup> *The Summa Theologiae*, First Part, Question 75, Article 2.

<sup>60</sup> *The Summa Theologiae*, First Part, Question 75, Article 1.

Aristotle, the body is the product of the first actualization of the soul having life within it potentially. The soul both determines the body and is formally inseparable from it.

Is the body a necessary component of the human person since it does not survive death like the soul does? Aquinas answers yes. He restates Augustine and other Church Fathers' beliefs on the Gnostics and Pagans stating, "For certain heretics asserted that all bodily things are from the evil principle, but that spiritual things are from the good principle: and from this it follows that the soul cannot reach the height of its perfection unless it be separated from the body, since the latter withdraws it from its principle, the participation of which makes it happy."<sup>61</sup> The Gnostics and Pagans dismissed the body as a mere vessel for the soul, overlooking the fact that without it, there would be no means of engaging with the forms manifesting in the material world.

Aquinas goes on to state why this view of the body is mistaken. For, if there was no body to desire happiness, and if the release of the soul from the body were enough to reach pure happiness and participation with God, then there would be no use of a resurrection as stated in the Bible. He goes on to state that in the form of a human being, a necessary component of that form is a material body. If it was not necessary to have a body, everyone would be an angel, made of pure form and therefore pure actuality, albeit limited in scope by the angelic essence. God, by contrast, is pure actuality with no limiting essences.

Aquinas believes that when the body is separated from the soul, all sensory and nutritive powers indicative of having a body bound by matter are absent.<sup>62</sup> He notices that "it seems that the whole soul is not separated from the body, but only the intellective powers of the soul, and

---

<sup>61</sup> The *Summa Theologiae*, Third Part, Question 75, Article 1

<sup>62</sup> *Ibid*, Fourth Part, Question 70, Article 1

consequently not the sensitive or vegetative powers.”<sup>63</sup> The operations belonging to the body are left with the body while the operations belonging to the soul, such as intellectualization and cognition, are separated/distinct. However, Aquinas goes on to note that “the sensitive and other like powers” remain in the separated soul “radically in the same way as a result of is in its principle: because there remains in the separated soul the ability to produce these powers.”<sup>64</sup>

After the death of the body, St. Thomas Aquinas believes that the soul requires a resurrection to fulfill its purpose. Aquinas points out a flaw in Augustine’s philosophy, stating, “it follows that if happiness is attained by the soul alone, man would not be balked in his natural desire for happiness, and so there is no need to hold the resurrection.”<sup>65</sup> Aquinas believes that since the material body is necessarily included within the form of a human being, true happiness will not be reached until both the soul and the body are united. So, in order for the two to be in union again after death, the Resurrection must take place.

#### **Section Four: Comparing and Contrasting Augustine and Aquinas**

There are many similarities between Augustine and Aquinas. For one, they both believe that the soul and the body are distinct from one another. However, Augustine views the soul as capable of attaining absolute happiness once it is freed from the control of the body. Aquinas, on the other hand, believes that there is no possibility for happiness unless the soul is in unification with the body, as the human is a hylomorphic being, and its essence calls for it to be composed of body and soul. To be in alignment with its essence, a human needs both the body and the soul. Due to his philosophical demonstration that the soul and body need to be in union for happiness

---

<sup>63</sup> Ibid Article 1

<sup>64</sup> Ibid Article 1

<sup>65</sup> The Summa Theologiæ, SUPPLEMENTUM TERTIÆ PARTIS, Question 75, Article 1.

to be attained, Aquinas then has the ability to turn the necessity of the Resurrection from a theological matter to one that could begin to be argued philosophically.

I also find Aquinas's philosophy to further expound upon Augustine's view. For example: Augustine believes that God can be reached by an inward exploration of one's self.<sup>66</sup> I find this to be problematic, as it seems to be an esoteric explanation of how one is able to reach God, with its grounding being in mystical experience. Aquinas does not hold these same Platonic views of the body as a vessel that Augustine does, instead opting to demonstrate by Aristotelian methodology that the soul and the body are unified and ultimately inseparable. For Aquinas, looking inward would be seen as an unscientific endeavor, and could lead to dismissing the importance of the material component of our human nature. For Aquinas, invoking the Inner Self has its place in mysticism, not scientific philosophy.

I also believe that Augustine treats the Resurrection as a solely theological matter, with no input from philosophical considerations. For the Resurrection to occur, there must be at least some necessity for a physical body in relation to the soul, rather than it just being a vessel. Augustine relies upon the Christian tradition to explain why the Resurrection occurs, and his view of the Resurrection is therefore theological and not philosophical in nature. Aquinas, on the other hand, bases the need for a Resurrection on the necessary unification between the mind and the body, as those two things are what define a human being's essence. While Augustine's view of the Resurrection is completely valid, it is necessary that one look at the Resurrection through a Thomistic framework in order to show it argued for in a philosophical manner.

---

<sup>66</sup> Ruden, *Confessions*, Book X, pg. 286

"But I'll climb up to him by way of my soul just the same. I'll pass beyond my own vitality, with which I adhere to my body and fill its framework with vital essence. It isn't through this strength that I find my God, as in that case a horse or a mule could find him, too; they have no understanding; but it's the same stamina that animates their bodies."

At root, the main differences between Augustine and Aquinas regarding the body and mind are parallel to the differences between Plato and Aristotle. Whereas Plato adopts a more mystical view of the nature of the human being, Aristotle opts for a view grounded in the natural world. The main thing that makes Augustine and Aquinas different is that they're both using these different frameworks to explain the same Catholic doctrine. My viewpoint is that the Thomistic conception is more philosophically concise and well-argued than the Augustinian conception, which is based more in Neoplatonic ontology, mysticism, and theological doctrine.

## Bibliography

1. Kennedy, Daniel. "St. Thomas Aquinas." *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. Vol. 14. New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1912.
2. Führer, Markus, "Albert the Great", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Summer 2019 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.)
3. Stoljar, Daniel, "Physicalism", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2017 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.),
4. Robinson, Howard, "Dualism", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2017 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.),
5. Augustine, *Confessions*, Translated by J.G. Pilkington, From Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, First Series, Vol. 1. Edited by Philip Schaff. (Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1887.) Revised and edited for New Advent by Kevin Knight.
6. Augustine, *Confessions*, Translated by Sarah Ruden, The Modern Library, 2018
7. Arendzen, John. "Manichæism." *The Catholic Encyclopedia*. Vol. 9. New York: Robert Appleton Company, 1910.
8. Encyclopædia Britannica, *Mani*, Added by contributors, April 10, 2020
9. New World Encyclopedia contributors, "Manichaeism," *New World Encyclopedia*
10. Watson, Gerard. "'I Doubt, Therefore I Am': St. Augustine and Scepticism." *The Maynooth Review / Revieú Mhá Nuad* 12 (1985): 42-50
11. Mendelson, Michael, "Saint Augustine," *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2010 Edition),
12. Christopher M. Brown, *Thomas Aquinas*, Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy
13. Ainsworth, Thomas, "Form vs. Matter", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Spring 2016 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.),
14. Gerson, Lloyd, "Plotinus", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2018 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.)
15. Dera Sipe. Soul/Body Dualism in Porphyry and. Augustine. Villanova University. 2006
16. Holoduek Jr, John Charles. "The Philosophy of Neoplatonism and Its Effects on the Thought of St. Augustine of Hippo." *Dialogue: Journal of Phi Sigma Tau* 55, no. 2-3 (April 1, 2013): 136-57. pg. 153
17. Armstrong, A. H. "'Emanation' in Plotinus." *Mind* 46, no. 181 (1937): 61-66.
18. Howard Rachlin, *The Escape of the Mind*, Oxford University Press, 2014, pg. 28
19. Philip Cary, *Augustine's Invention of the Inner Self: The Legacy of a Christian Platonist*, John Hopkins University Press, 2001, pg. 64

20. Augustine, *On the Trinity*, Translated by Arthur West Haddan. From Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, First Series, Vol. 3. Edited by Philip Schaff. (Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1887.) Revised and edited for New Advent by Kevin Knight.
21. Augustine, *City of God*, Book XX, Translated by Marcus Dods. From Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers, First Series, Vol. 2. Edited by Philip Schaff. (Buffalo, NY: Christian Literature Publishing Co., 1887.) Revised and edited for New Advent by Kevin Knight.
22. Holy Bible, New International Version, New York, 1978
23. Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, Translated by W.D. Ross, Oxford Publishing, 1981
24. Aristotle, *De Anima*, Based on the translation by E. M. Edghill, with minor emendations by Daniel Kolak
25. St. Thomas Aquinas, *The Summa Theologiæ of St. Thomas Aquinas*, Second and Revised Edition, 1920, Literally translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province