

Objection 1. It would seem that pride should be reckoned a capital vice, since Isidore* and Cassian† number pride among the capital vices.

Objection 2. Further, pride is apparently the same as vainglory, since both covet excellence. Now vainglory is reckoned a capital vice. Therefore pride also should be reckoned a capital vice.

Objection 3. Further, Augustine says (*De Virginit.* xxxi) that “pride begets envy, nor is it ever without this companion.” Now envy is reckoned a capital vice, as stated above (q. 36, a. 4). Much more therefore is pride a capital vice.

On the contrary, Gregory (*Moral.* xxxi, 45) does not include pride among the capital vices.

I answer that, As stated above (Aa. 2,5, ad 1) pride may be considered in two ways; first in itself, as being a special sin; secondly, as having a general influence towards all sins. Now the capital vices are said to be certain special sins from which many kinds of sin arise. Where-

fore some, considering pride in the light of a special sin, numbered it together with the other capital vices. But Gregory, taking into consideration its general influence towards all vices, as explained above (a. 2, obj. 3), did not place it among the capital vices, but held it to be the “queen and mother of all the vices.” Hence he says (*Moral.* xxxi, 45): “Pride, the queen of vices, when it has vanquished and captured the heart, forthwith delivers it into the hands of its lieutenants the seven principal vices, that they may despoil it and produce vices of all kinds.”

This suffices for the Reply to the First Objection.

Reply to Objection 2. Pride is not the same as vainglory, but is the cause thereof: for pride covets excellence inordinately: while vainglory covets the outward show of excellence.

Reply to Objection 3. The fact that envy, which is a capital vice, arises from pride, does not prove that pride is a capital vice, but that it is still more principal than the capital vices themselves.

* Comment. in Deut. xvi † De Inst. Caenob. v, 1: Collat. v, 2