“In Christ our Lord the whole revelation of God is summed up” (Vatican II, Dei Verbum, 7). Everything that Christians profess by faith is related in some way to the person and work of Jesus Christ. The particular subject matter of this course deals with what Christians profess by faith about the person of Jesus Christ and how the understanding of that mystery (or the intellectus fidei) developed in the life, worship, and teachings of the Church throughout the centuries (or what is called in systematic theology “Christology”). Special attention is devoted to the first seven century of the Church and to primary readings of key theologians and councils whose writings and solemn definitions have influenced subsequent theological reflection.

The first part of the semester considers the Christology of the primitive church. Special attention is given here to what can be known of the life and ministry of the historical Jesus and the understanding of the mystery of Christ as preached and confessed in the apostolic and sub-apostolic church. The second part of the semester considers the Christology of the post-apostolic and early church. As the apostolic preaching and doxological professions about the person of Jesus Christ was being transmitted in the life and worship of the Church, Christians found it necessary to make intelligible the mystery of Christ in their encounter with heretical teachings and with the pagan world and its philosophies. The theologians during this period were groping for intelligible explanations about the immense mystery that is Jesus Christ. Here we will encounter different approaches and competing formulas to make intelligible this mystery. The ambiguities and insufficient explanations of one generation of theologians is exploited by heretics of the next generation who in turn provide the impetus for more precious articulation and for the solemn definitions about the person of Christ in the early Ecumenical Councils. Finally, the semester concludes with the understanding of the hypostatic union as discussed and debated in the Middle Ages.

By the end of this course students should have acquire the following outcomes: [1] the knowledge of what Christians profession about the person of Christ and the development of the understanding of that profession in the historical periods covered in class; [2] understand the connections of those developments in their socio-historical context; [3] to improve the ability to read primary source material and to analyze critically the theological arguments in them; and [4] to make connections between theology and other disciplines like philosophy and history.
**Course Requirements and Grading**

In order to assess how well students achieve the aforementioned goals, students must satisfy the following course requirements: quizzes (8%); executive summaries (22%), a research paper (25%), mid-term exam (20%), and final exam (25%).

Please note that attendance is expected. Students who are frequently absent will have difficulty passing the examinations and therefore the course. The professor reserves the right assign an “F” to any student that exceeds ten absences during the semester.

**Five Quizzes—8%**

There will be seven quizzes scheduled throughout the semester. The two lowest grades will be dropped. There will be *no make-up quizzes* whatsoever, even in cases of excused absences. And no quizzes will be distributed to student who come in late, so be sure to arrive on time. Note also that the quiz only covers the reading with which it is listed in the course schedule. For example, the first quiz covers “Kereszty, p. 72-92,” not the other readings schedule for that period.

**12 Executive Summaries of Assigned Primary Reading—22%**

A number of primary source materials will be assigned that will require the submission of an executive summary (see due dates in course schedule). Specifics regarding each summary are provided in the course schedule. Each submission is graded as pass or fail.

The purpose of these writing assignments is to allow students an opportunity to read carefully the primary source material and make intelligible in writing the teaching expressed therein. A number of these primary readings will require multiple readings and an appreciation of their full signification will be a process that starts with your own reading and summary, that continues into the class discussion where difficulties are worked out, and that come together in your preparation for the examinations.

Please note that a written copy of the executive summary must be turn in at the beginning of the class period in which it is due. **Late summaries will not be accepted for any reason.**

**Two Exams—20% and 25%**

The exams will cover material from your readings and the class lectures. The format will include objective questions (e.g., true/false and multiple-choice) which are drawn from the assigned reading and lecture notes, and subjective questions (essays) which are drawn from the primary readings. The second exam will be cumulative in that I filter the **subjective questions** of the mid-term into the objective questions of final. Studies guides for the two exams are posted in Blackboard.

The essay questions are weighed more heavily than the objective questions, and so let me be very clear about my expectations with regard to the essay questions. Because you are given the study guide with its list of possible essay questions on the first day of class, I
expect all students to have formulating written responses to the essay questions several
times before the day of the exam, that is, students should have written a response before
class based on a careful reading of the secondary and primary readings, after class based
on the class lecture/discussion and further reflection on the secondary and primary
readings, and again while preparing for the exam. Consequently, I expect your essays to
be of a very high quality, that is, accurate, clear, concise, and intelligible. If at any time
you have trouble understanding the reading or formulating a written response, then I have
provided four occasions to work out these issues: 1) because you have carefully read the
assigned reading and tried to formulate a written answer before coming to class, whatever
problems or questions you have can be addressed in class on the day the subject matter is
discussed; 2) if after reformulating your answer after that class you still have questions,
then these can be handled in the next class period when I open the class with a review; 3)
if you encounter more problems afterwards, then these can be handled in the in-class
review on the class period before the exam; 4) and if you still have problems, then come
by my office or send me an email.

Normally there are no make-up examinations. In the case of illness or some other
personal emergency the student may request a make-up examination. Note also that
make-up exams are essay examinations that are more difficult than the normal exams. In
order to request a make-up exam, please note the following instructions: 1) Request must
be made well in advance of the examination (i.e., not on the day of the exam); 2) After I
approve the request, you must call the Testing Center (713-525-3160) to schedule an
appointment. The make-up exam must be taken before the start of the class period
that immediately follows the exam day. 3) After you schedule an appointment with the
Testing Center, send me your testing schedule via email (after which, I can send the
make-up exam over to the Testing Center).

Research Paper—25%

You will be responsible for a research paper (argumentative prose) of 5 to 8 pages (ca. 10
to 12 pages for MA students) that follows the Chicago Manual of Style (15th edition;
which can now be accessed through an online database in the library website). Your
thesis must state an argument pertaining specifically to Christology, not Trinity,
soteriology, ecclesiology, et al.; although, the thesis may certainly be defended in the
body of the paper with arguments from Trinitarian theology, soteriology, et al.. The
bibliography must include the relevant primary sources of the theologian/council, as well
as at least five important secondary works of recent scholarship. Because you will likely
need to ILL these secondary sources, I strongly suggest that you begin now.

Before a student can submit the final copy of their carefully written paper that has been
thoroughly proofread, s/he must submit a series of gateway assignments. The gateway
assignment are pass/fail and do not count directly toward the final grade. However, no
final paper will be accepted until all the gateway submission have been satisfied. See
below for submission dates.

Gateway Submissions:
1) **Thursday, Jan. 29**—Submit a **topic statement** that simply and broadly indicates what you want to research. Most students will choose a topic situated in the sub-discipline of biblical or historical theology. For example, if you are interested in Paul’s Christology, then you could select research on the Christological hymn in Phil. 2. If you were interested in Thomas Aquinas, then you could select research on his Christology.

2) **Thursday, March 26**—I consider this the most important phase of your research paper. Since Jan. 20, I would expect that you would have gathered, read, kept or discarded as many secondary writings as possible relevant to your topic. On March 26, I want you to submit a properly formatted, annotated bibliography of the secondary writings you found relevant to your paper (that is, for each entry statement a brief rationale on why it is listed on your bibliography).

3) **Tuesday, March 31**—**Thesis Statement**

4) **Tuesday, April 1**—Due: At least three supporting arguments for your [revised] thesis statement

**Final Submission: Thursday, April 30.**

Posted in Blackboard are a number of aids for writings an argumentative prose. A writing guide is provided that offers information on what a thesis statement is, the different kinds of thesis statements, how to defend a thesis in the body of the paper, and so on. Also included in Blackboard is a list of possible topics from which a thesis can be developed, as well as some miscellaneous consideration to keep in mind while researching.

In place of the research paper I will accept English translation(s) of a Latin writing(s). This translation assignment is only for students who have completed at least two semesters of Latin (three semesters is highly recommended). Interested students should meet with the professor as soon as possible to discuss the details and feasibility of this translation assignment.

**Departmental Criteria for Grading Standards**

_A range = Superior, exceptional, outstanding._ The assignment demonstrates critical, informed, and creative theological inquiry that reflects superior understanding of essential theological/historical concepts. This means the student demonstrates depth of insight beyond what is normally expected. Carefully nuanced reasoning and writing, free from material, structural and grammatical error are presupposed in this grade.

_B range = Good._ The assignment demonstrates ready command of full range of concepts and shows some critical, informed, and creative inquiry that reflects above average understanding of essential theological/historical concepts. This means the student has produced an assignment that is free from material, structural and grammatical errors.

_C range = Acceptable._ The assignment demonstrates satisfactory ability to describe overall picture and essential concepts. This means the student has completed the assignment in a manner involving no significant errors. Material may not be free from structural and grammatical errors. Nuanced reasoning is not demonstrated.
$D\ range = Below\ average$. The assignment demonstrates reasoning that is neither carefully nuanced nor coherently presented; writing is insufficient in depth of insight and/or use of texts; presentation is not free from material error in structure, spelling and grammar. This means that the student failed to respond adequately to the assignment and its intentions.

$F = Unsatisfactory$. In one or more of the following ways the student: 1) failed to turn in the assignment; 2) did not respond to the assignment as given; 3) submitted work so thoroughly flawed as to indicate that the student did not make a serious effort, 4) was involved in plagiarism or cheating.

**Grading Scale**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scores/Letters</th>
<th>GPA</th>
<th>Scores/Letters</th>
<th>GPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>100-95</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>C+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A-</td>
<td>94-90</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B+</td>
<td>89-87</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>C-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>86-84</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B-</td>
<td>83-80</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Students with Disabilities**

Any student who feels that he/she may need academic accommodations in order to meet the requirements of this course—as outlined in the syllabus—due to presence of a disability, should contact the Office of Counseling and Disability Services (C&DS). The following statement was prepared by the C&DS:

Any student with a documented disability needing academic accommodations is requested to speak with Deborah Jones as early as possible. All discussions will remain confidential. Students with disabilities will also need to contact Counseling and Disability Services in Crooker Center. This office can be reached at (713) 525-2169 or 6953.

**Academic Integrity**

Students should be acquainted with the University's "Policy on Academic Dishonesty" found in the Undergraduate Catalog. According to that catalog:

Every offense against academic honesty seriously undermines the teaching-learning process for which the University exists, and such offenses will be dealt with expeditiously according to the following criteria. Academic dishonesty includes but is not limited to:

1. Cheating on an examination or test; for example, by copying from another’s paper or using unauthorized materials before or during the test;
2. Plagiarism, which represents as one’s own the work of another, whether published or not, without acknowledging the precise source;
3. Knowing participation in the academic dishonesty of another student, even though one’s own work is not directly affected;
4. Any conduct which reasonable persons in similar circumstances would recognize as dishonest in an academic setting.

The penalty for an incident of academic dishonesty is, at the discretion of the faculty member, either a mark of zero for the work in question or the grade of “F” for the course.
**REQUIRED TEXTS**


All other readings will be provided in Blackboard (BB).

**COURSE SCHEDULE**

1. Tuesday, January 13—Introduction to Course

   **Part One: Christology of the OT/NT**

2. Thursday, January 15—Lecture 1: Christology of the OT
   - Bible: Proverbs 1:20-33, 8:1-36; Job 28:12-28
   - BB: Gerald O’Collins, *The Tripersonal God*, 23-34

3. Tuesday, January 20—Lecture 2a: Method of NT Christology (Quest for the Historical Jesus)
   - Kereszty, p. 3-17 (Note that there are study questions on p. 502-503 from which objective questions on quizzes and examinations are drawn).
   - BB: Gotthold Lessing (ed. Placher, 101-103); Albert Schweitzer (ed. Placher, 152-53); and Rudolf Bultmann (ed. Placher, 170-174).
   - **Due: Executive Summary 1 of Lessing, Schweitzer, and Bultmann.** Lessing is usually identified with the so-called Old Quest for the historical Jesus, Schwietzer the famous transitional figure into the Second Quest, and Bultmann as the most famous representative of the Second Quest. Compare and contract them with regard to the following issues. First, they all in their own way deny the “historical Jesus” (a term first used by Schweitzer). How do Lessing and Schwietzer do this? Second, focus on Bultmann since he is most important. According to Bultmann,
what kind of information is recorded in the Gospels? Where does this information derive? What specifically is “demythologization”? According to Bultmann, what is the resurrection of Christ?

4. Thursday, January 21— Lecture 2b: Method of NT Christology (Historical Foundation of Faith in Christ)
   o Kereszty, p. 17-33
   o BB: ITC, “Selected Questions on Christology” (1979), 185-88 (pp. 189-223 is provided as suggested reading)
   o **Due: Executive Summary 2 of ITC “Selected Questions on Christology.”** IN your summary of the arguments of the ITC, be sure to keep the following question in mind. According to the ITC, what is the relationship between the historical Jesus and the Jesus of faith (i.e., what is the relationship between history and the faith)? What is the value of historical research for the faith? What errors do they specifically want to avoid? What is the genre of the Gospels? What kind of “history” do they contain (i.e., a modern notion or something else)?

5. Tuesday, January 27—Lecture 3: Death and Resurrection
   o Bible: Mk 16:9-20 || Jn 21:1-23
   o Bible: 1Cor 15:3-5
   o Kereszty, p. 33-75

6. Thursday, January 29—Lecture 4: Beginning of the Gospel (Virginal Conception and Jesus’ Family)
   o Bible: Mt 1:18-2:23 || Lk 1:5-2:52
   o Kereszty, p. 76-97. **Quiz 1 over Kereszty, 76-97.**
   o **Due: Topic Statement for your Research Paper**

7. Tuesday, February 3— Lecture 5: Jesus and the Kingdom
   o Kereszty, p. 98-153. **Quiz 2**

8. Thursday, February 5—Lecture 6: The Kingdom and Death of Jesus (The implicit soteriology and Christology of the historical Jesus)
   o Bible: Mt 16:21 || Mk 8:31 || Lk 9:22 (see also Mk 8:31; 9:31; 10:33f; Lk 11:46-47; 13:33)
   o Bible: Mk 14:57ff || Mt 26:60ff || Jn 2:19ff (Narrative of the Temple’s Destruction)
   o Bible: Mt 26:26-29 || Lk 22:18-20 || Mk 14:17-25 || 1Cor. 11:23-25 (Last Supper)

9. Tuesday, February 10—Lecture 7: Understanding the Mystery of Christ (the implicit and explicit ‘name-Christology’ of the NT tradition)
   o Kereszty, p. 154-175
10. Thursday, February 12—Lecture 7 (cont.): Understanding the Mystery of Christ (the implicit and explicit ‘name-Christology’ of the NT tradition)
   o Bible: Phil. 2:6-11
   o Kereszty, p. 176-193

   Part Two: Christology of the Early Church

11. Tuesday, February 17—Introduction to Patristic Christology
   o Kereszty, p. 197-229. **Quiz 3 over p. 197-229.**
   o Kereszty, 230-235

12. Thursday, February 19—TBD

13. Tuesday, February 24—Christology of the Apostolic Fathers: Irenaeus of Lyon
   o Norris, 1-12 (Intro); 49-60 (Irenaeus of Lyons).
   o Suggested Reading—BB: Tapia, 13-18
   o **Due: Executive Summary 3 of Irenaeus of Lyons (Norris, 49-60).** In our selected reading, Irenaeus is developing his Christology in a polemic against various heresies (for our purposes focus on his polemic against Docetism and Adoptionism). How does he understand these two Christological heresies? How specifically are they contrary to the faith? With what arguments (soteriological, biblical, and moral) does he combat these heresies? With regard to the soteriological arguments, the heretical dualism or their denial of flesh (*sarx*) destroys human salvation? How specifically? How does Irenaeus’ view of salvation history (*oikonomia*) and his recapitulation theory necessitates the unity of Christ and the Logos (“Christ, one and the same”).

14. Thursday, February 26—Latin Christology in the 3rd Century: Tertullian
   o Kereszty, 240-243
   o BB: Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrine*, 149-161. **Quiz 4**
   o Norris, 12-17 (Intro), 61-72 (Tertullian).
   o Suggested Reading—BB: Tapia, 80-82, 82-88.
   o **Due: Executive Summary 4 of Tertullian (Norris, 61-72).** Tertullian is the first Latin theologian to use key terms like “person,” “substance,” and “nature” in Christology. The question he asks is explicit to our assignment: “How did the Word become flesh?” You will also need to consider how, according to Tertullian, the Word did not become flesh. During the class discussion, we will need to determine whether Tertullian’s Christology leans more to a unitive emphasis or a divisive one. In *On the Flesh of Christ* (against a famous Gnostic heretic, Marcion), Tertullian discusses whether the incarnation was impossible or unsuitable. How does he respond?

15. Tuesday, March 3—Review

16. Thursday, March 5—Mid-Term Examination

   Monday, March 9—Saturday, March 14: **Spring Break**
17. Tuesday, March 17—Greek Christology in the 3rd Century: Origen
   o Norris, 73-81 (Origen)
   o Suggestion Reading—O’Collins, 151-83; Tapia, 48-56; 56-63.
   o **Due: Properly Formatted, Annotated Bibliography for Research Paper (that is, for each entry statement a brief rationale on why this book is listed on your bibliography).**
   o **Due: Executive Summary 5 of Origen (Norris, 73-81).** Discuss Origen’s Christology with regard to the following issues: What exactly is unified? What kind of union is this? What is the result of such a union (or what kind of result does Origen intend to achieve)? Where does he locate the distinction? How does his view of the union allow him to uphold the impeccability of the incarnate Word? What is the strength and weaknesses of his Christology?

18. Thursday, March 19—No Class

19. Tuesday, March 24—No Class

20. Thursday, March 26—Pre-Nicene Christology. Arius and St. Athanasius
   o Kereszty, 235-237
   o Hardy, 329-34 (Arius & the Arians);
   o Suggested Reading: Hardy, 335-40 (Eusebius of Caesarea)
   o Norris, 83-101 (Athanasius); Hardy, 70-73, 95-98 (Athanasius)
   o **Executive Summary 6 on Athanasius (tr. Norris, 83-101).** For this short summary answer the following questions: 1) Where is his emphasis? On the unity or the distinction in Christ? 2) Does Athanasius find a place for the human rational soul in Christ? 3) How does he deal with Christ’s human weaknesses, i.e., both his physical and psychological, e.g., hunger and ignorance?

   o Kereszty, 237-239; 243-256 (**Quiz 5 over 243-256**)
   o Norris, 103-11 (Apollinarius); Hardy, 343-45 (Synodical Letter of the Council of Constantinople, 382); Hardy, 215-232 (Gregory of Nazianzus)
   o **Executive Summary 7 on Apollinarius and Gregory of Nazianzus.** Rather than a linear summary of the reading, compare and contrast the Christologies of Nestorius and Cyril based on their understanding of the union and distinction in Christ. A union and distinction of what? What kind of union? What are their key formulas?

Thursday, April 3—Thursday, April 2—Friday, April 4: Easter Break

22. Tuesday, April 7—Cyril of Alexandria, Nestorious, and the Council of Ephesus, 431
   o Cont. Gregory of Nazianzus (Hardy, 215-232).
   o Nestorius (Norris, 123-131; Hardy, 346-348)
   o Cyril of Alexandria (Hardy, 349-54; Norris, 131-135)
   o Formula of Union, 433 (Hardy, 355-58)
Executive Summary 8 on Nestorius and Cyril of Alexandria. Rather than a linear summary of the reading, compare and contrast the Christologies of Nestorius and Cyril based on their understanding of the union and distinction in Christ. A union and distinction of what? What kind of union? What are their key formulas?

23. Thursday, April 9—Monophysitism, Pope Leo the Great, and the Council of Chalcedon, 451
   o Cont. Council of Ephesus (if needed)
   o Lecture on Eutyches and the Monophysite tradition.
   o Pope Leo, *The Tome of Leo* (Hardy, 359-370)
   o Council of Chalcedon, 451 (Hardy, 371-374)
   o Due: Thesis Statement
   o Executive Summary 9. Even today Pope Leo is accused by the Monophysite tradition of separating the two natures of Christ in an heretical way based on what he said particular in sections 3-4 of the reading (pp. 363-66). Does Pope Leo’s notion of two natures and two activities make his notion of union (*communio*) too loose?

24. Tuesday, April 14—Council of Constantinople II (553) & III (680-81)
   o Kereszty, 256-262 (Quiz 6)
   o Lecture on Post-Chalcedonian Christology
   o Councils of Constantinople II, 553 (Hardy, 377-381)
   o Councils of Constantinople III, 680-81 (Hardy, 382-85)
   o Due: At least three supporting arguments for your [revised] thesis statement

25. Thursday, April 16—Peter Lombard and the Three Views of the Hypostatic Union
   o Kereszty, 263-278 (Quiz 7);
   o Peter Lombard, *Sent.* 3.6-7 (BB)
   o Due: Executive Summary 10 on Peter Lombard. Peter Lombard (d. 1160) published his *Sentences* ca. 1156/7, and his description of the three theories or opinions of the Hypostatic Union in Book 3, Distinctions 6-7 will become the cornerstone of all future treatment. Today these models are called the Homo Assumptus Theory (III.6.2.1-9; III.7.1.1-3), the Subsistence Theory (III.3.1-6; III.7.1.4-15), and the Habitus Theory (III.6.4-6; III.7.16-17).¹ Also important for distinguishing these views is the statement in distinction two “a common species is not predicated of Christ” (*in Domino Iesu Christo non est communem speciem accipere*),² the treatment in distinction ten on whether whether “Christ as man is something” (*Christus secundum homo est aliquid*), the treatment in distinctions 11

¹ See *Sent.* III.6-7 (SB 5, 49-66). The three views as described by Peter Lombard have been examined by Lauge Olaf Nielsen, *Theology and Philosophy in the Twelfth Century* (Leiden: Brill, 1982), 246-64. He also provides excellent treatments of and bibliography for Gilbert of Poitiers, Hugh of St. Victor, Peter Abelard and his school, and Peter Lombard and his school. See also N. Häring, “The Case of Gilbert de la Porrée Bishop of Poitiers,” *Mediaeval Studies* 13 (1951), 26-39; W. Principe, *William of Auxerre’s Theology of the Hypostatic Union*, (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 1963), 64-70; M. Colish, *Peter Lombard* (Leiden, Brill, 1994), 1.399-438.

² See *Sent.* III.2.13 (SB 5, 28).
and 12 on whether Christ is a creature or whether he had a beginning, and the discussion in distinction twenty-two on whether Christ is a man in the grave. For the purpose of this executive summary, focus on the following questions: 1) What are the distinctive teachings of the Homo-Assumptus and Habitus Theories; 2) How does Lombard distinguish them from the other; 3) Peter Lombard’s description of the Subsistence Theory is a bit tricky, but try to decipher its characteristic features as well.

26. Tuesday, April 21—Christology in the Post-Lombardian Period
   o Selected readings from Simon of Tournai and Prepositinus (I will provide English translation and upload in BB)
   o Due: Executive Summary 11 on Simon of Tournai and Prepositinus. Simon of Tournai flourished in the 1160’s and 1170’s as a very famous magister in Paris. His Institutiones in sacram paginem was written in the early 1160’s, and he provides us one of the earliest summa’s that relies extensively on Peter Lombard’s Sentences. While Simon was writing this, the Habitus Theory found wide-spread support (at least until its condemnation in 1176), and proponents of the Homo-Assumptus Theory were the fiercest critics (Robert of Melun labeled it “heretical” in the late 1150’s). Simon, who supports the Subsistence Theory, agrees with the criticisms of the Habitus Theory proposed by proponents of the Homo-Assumptus Theory, but he was also adamantly opposed the Homo-Assumptus Theory (he thinks it is heretical). Using the constitutive features of the Subsistence Theory, Simon very subtly navigates between the two competing theories and offers solutions that avoid their pitfalls. Thanks in part to Simon, the Subsistence Theory will become the dominate theory in the late 12th century and the only acceptable theory in the 13th century. Prepositinus, writing some 30/40 years after Simon and whose importance cannot be stressed enough, supports the Subsistence Theory and adds greater clarity to it, specifically by making clear key terms like “substance” and “nature” that are used somewhat confusingly in the mid-12th century.

   In preparation for this assignment, provide a summary of Simon’s understanding of the Homo-Assumptus Theory and the Habitus Theory, and his critic of them. Also provide a summary of Prepositinus’ description of the Subsistence Theory as well as how this view differs from the Homo-Assumptus Theory.

27. Tuesday, April 23—Thomas Aquinas
   Due: Executive Summary of Thomas Aquinas (I will provide more direct by April 15).

28. Thursday, April 28—TBD
29. Thursday, April 30—Review for Final Examination

30. Final Exam—Tuesday, May 12 from 8:30AM PM – 11:00 AM (HUGH 108)

---

3 E.g., Sent. III.11.1 (SB 5, 77-78) and III.12.1 (SB 5, 80-81).
4 See Sent. III.22.1 (SB 5, 135-136).