John Capreolus (c. 1380-1444) and Thomas de Vio Cajetan (1469-1534) are often claimed by scholars to hold the view that the essence of a creature has its own being (esse) which is independent of God’s efficient causality and the creature’s own act of existence. This understanding of essence supposedly obscures Thomas Aquinas’ most fundamental views on essence and existence. Etienne Gilson thought that Dominic Banez (1428-1604) was among the few Thomists to grasp Thomas’ own position. Banez criticizes both Cajetan and Capreolus for thinking that the creature’s being is only an ultimate perfection, and Cajetan for stating that related view that a form in act can be signified apart from its relation (respectus) to existence (esse). My talk will show how Banez’ criticism of these earlier figures gives a more sympathetic account of their views even while he more accurately pinpoints their semantic and metaphysical difficulties.