**Gradations of Volition in St. Anselm's Philosophical Psychology:**

**An Essay in Honor of Father Joseph Owens, C.Ss.R.**

“Student: Why does (a man) will? Teacher: Only because he wills. For (the) will has no other cause by which it is forced or attracted, but it is its own efficient cause, so to speak, as well as its own effect.”

St. Anselm, *On the Fall of Satan*
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**Introduction**

I demonstrate here that St. Anselm”s understanding of free will fits neatly into an Aristotelian conceptual framework. Aristotle”s four causes are first aligned with Anselm”s four senses of “will”**.**[[1]](#footnote-2) The volitional hierarchy Anselm”s definition of free will entails is then detailed, culminating in its reconciliation with Eudaimonism.The *summum bonum* turns out to be the apex of that series of actualizations or perfections.[[2]](#footnote-3)I conclude by explicating Anselm’s teleological understanding of sin by reference to his analog of Aristotle’s essence-accident distinction.

**Anselm’s Four Significates of ‘Will’**

Anything generated, according to Aristotle, will exist because of four causes or principles: matter, form, purpose, and agency.[[3]](#footnote-4) His paradigmatic applications of this etiology are to the coming to be of organisms and artifacts- substantial change- and their accidental, physical alterations. I shall extend it here to cover the accidental changes that occur mentally during the deliberations that Aristotle himself posits as antecedent to our voluntary behavior. Choices are said to be “made,” no different in this regard than substances such as an apple, so the complex question must also be asked of them: from what, by what, through what, and for what do they arise? We should be able to learn how a human agent became willing to take a certain course of action, or ill or good willed, by determining such accidental compounds”material, efficient, teleological, and formal causes.[[4]](#footnote-5) Seen from the perspective of Aristotles assertion that “The stick moves the stone, the hand moves the stick, and the man moves the hand,” my contention is that the four causes enable us to analyze the power and process by which a man deliberates and chooses prior to voluntarily acting.

Anselm, for his part, asserts that ‘will’ must be taken as having four interrelated “significates” or denotations.[[5]](#footnote-6) These distinctions correspond to those just adumbrated; a good sign of the Aristotelian background of the Father of Scholasticism”s thinking here. ‘Will’ signifies firstly the soul as “instrument-for-willing” or agent (will**a**): its power to (rationally) determine its own course of action- “will” in a second signification, will**c**, (commonly referred to as “choice”). Will**a**, thus, exercises “motive power,” posited by Aristotle in *Metaphysics* as the source of contingency in Nature.[[6]](#footnote-7) In *De Anima*,[[7]](#footnote-8) will**a** is what renders one a “human agent,” manifesting “rational, appetitive power.” Finally, as the agent-cause of will**c**, will**a** acquires moral responsibility for its existence and effects in behavior and, thence, upon others.

In serving as will**c**”s “efficient cause,” will**a** performs its characteristic act, *deliberation*, that is, exercising the Intellect so as to produce reasons for preferring one object of desire rather than another and the most efficient means thereto. Here we have the third, **verbal**, significate of “will”, will**e**: the actualizing of will**c**. (The difference between the three significates, Anselm says, corresponds to that between one”s visual apparatus, the sights it yields to one”s mind when active, and its operation so as to produce those visualizations.[[8]](#footnote-9)) From this basic mental act ensues the willingness**c** to pursue one axiological object rather than another, for reasons that justify that choice (without, *eo ipso*, being its causes): the will “as its own effect.”[[9]](#footnote-10) That is to say, will**a** is that power of the soul whose exercise- will**e**- brings will**c** into being ‘out of’ (the actualizations of) “will” in its fourth axiological *cum* motivational signification: will**a”s** divinely instilled, dualistic receptivity to the objectified values, justice and happiness **(**will**rj** andwill**rh).[[10]](#footnote-11)** The source of will**a**’s activity is its assimilation of those goods as desires, will**dhi** / will**dhi**, upon their beingintellectually recognized.[[11]](#footnote-12) This necessarily innate potency is, thus, the foundation of the volitional hierarchy about to be detailed.[[12]](#footnote-13) (We note in passing another remnant of Aristotelianism: realism regarding universals: justice and happiness, axiological transcendentals present in various apprehendable, material guises.[[13]](#footnote-14))

The Aristotelian background of Anselm’s thought here is even made terminologically manifest. In *OFD* 12, the genus will**r**, is said by Anselm to be “actuate(d)” with “determinate volition(s)” by receptivity to those specific goods. That is, will**r**, as receptivity to value in general, is treated as potential of focused attractions.Thus, will**rj** and will**rh** may be construed, as passive potencies, *a la* the Intellect in the case of categorical universals**.** Thence volitionally ensconced, upon relay from the Intellect, an axiological universal becomes will**di**- the *desire* for the instantiation whence it arose.Will**dhi** /will**dji** is, thus,will**rh** / will**rj** reduced to act, perfected.

Anselm deemed a dualistic conatus a prerequisite of moral responsibility.[[14]](#footnote-15) His insistence upon an axiological distinction within will**r** makes him an early, medieval proponent of what is now known as the Principle of Alternative Possibilities (PAP): an agent, to qualify as either praiseworthy or blameworthy, must be able to will**e** incommensurable types of goods.[[15]](#footnote-16) Were we incapable of willing**e** both happiness and justice, willing**r** but one, we could hardly be said to be responsible for the willing**e** of our *idee fixe*: the resulting will**c** would be a *fait accompli*, that is, no will**c** at all! The weighing of dichotomous alternatives, during the deliberations of will**a**, is, thus, deemed by Anselm a prerequisite of moral agency.

By extension, a being who has had his *character* bestowed upon him by His Creator, in the form of a monistic will**r**, cannot be responsible for the type of person that he is. Such accountability would require that he exhibit that character *rather than* one featuring an opposed set of priorities- something that he could have also ended up adopting, given his basic conatus. And the satisfaction of the desire to be responsible for one”s character is necessary aspect of creaturely freedom.[[16]](#footnote-17)

Deliberative dissonance provides a moral challenge for will**a** to meet on its own- a serious matter to resolve for credit- requiring it to decide between the mutually exclusive objects of two wills**d**. The material cause of a meritorious will**e** of will**a**- the basic act upon which all responsibility is founded- as well as the resulting willingness**c**, could only be opposed wills**d**. It is, then, a virtue of will**a** that it can stand in need of adjudication by itself, occasionally finding itself willing**d** more than one available good, while unable to remain indefinitely so suspended. Such a power renders character a matter of having sometimes to regain volitional integrity, *via* becoming one sort of agent rather than another. Being required in some situations to give pride of place in will**c** to a pre-ordained priority(as specified below) of will**r**’s objects, while abjuring the other,is what makes will**a** a fit object of approbation/reprobation.[[17]](#footnote-18) Anselm presents along these lines the case of a man agonizing over lying or being executed: an agentdesperately trying to resolve (become willing**c**) to do something for the sake of justice that promises, at least temporarily, not happiness, but great sorrow.[[18]](#footnote-19)

To reformulate, then, inlight of this dualistic understanding of motivation, Anselm’s third, active sense of “will”: will**e** is the reduction of will**dhi** /will**dji** to the willingness**c** to pursue the object thereof: will**chi** /will**cji**. That is, will**a**”s characteristic act is the application of the form willingness**c** to (the matter that is) one of its wills**d**. In so doing, will**a** becomes either will**chi** orwill**cji**.[[19]](#footnote-20) To answer, then, three of the four questions posed above, will**a** functions as the mental analog of Nature”sgeneration of organisms *via* seeds or parents: willing**e** will**cji /** will**chi** out ofwill**dji /** will**dhi**.

*Sans* such a reduction of itself, will**a** must remain in abeyance, having neither willed**e** nor (even) nillede any axiological object of which it is desirous.In other words, until such time as it brings about such a change in itself**,** based upon the intellectually supplied reasons in its favor, it remains contingent what it will become volitionally as will**c**. Will**a**, thus, completely controls itself, no other power or agent (nor even its own innate preference, stated below) can cause it to will**e** something should it be unwilling**e** to do so on its own. Anselm is rightly adamant that should will**a** be overcome by a particular temptation, the fault cannot lie in will**a** itself, which is intrinsically indomitable.[[20]](#footnote-21) No, the cause of sin (as teleologically explicated above) could only be a failure to fully exercise will”s**a** power to resist temptation. It is always self-induced *akrasia*, in the form of other illicit volitional attachments, that leads to giving in here:[[21]](#footnote-22) e.g., inordinate pride, in the case of Satan”s fall. Intellect would only rank axiological alternatives, goods or courses of action leading thereto, according to their conduciveness to the objects ofwill**r.** The actual imposition ofwill**c** upon any one of them- will**e**- is solely the prerogative of will**a**. Even Grace- will**djG-** is inefficacious until assimilated bywill**a** aswill**c** thereof**.[[22]](#footnote-23)**

Rational, self-caused reduction of will**dhi** /will**dji** to will**chi** /will**cji** is the “basic act,” sought by Arthur Danto and other philosophers, from which ultimate responsibility for resulting neural processes, bodily movements, activities and states of affairs is derived.[[23]](#footnote-24) Its performance renders will**a** an unmoved mover. Call this understanding of volitional autonomy the Principle of Absolute Self-Control/PASC.[[24]](#footnote-25) Vesting this originative power in agents themselves, rather than mental events of which they are merely subjects, makes Anselm, in contemporary terms, an “agent-causalist,” which, as alluded to above, is yet another element of Aristotle’s philosophical psychology.[[25]](#footnote-26)

As with cognition, in will**d** there is accidental identification of a particular mind and a universal of which it is act. But, unlike cognition, in will**c** there is *self*-incorporation of said universal: by will**a** as object thereof. The former is, thus, a passive, the latter an active, power. This distinction reflects the necessary connection between causation and responsibility, which Anselm must account for in order to justify eternal reward and punishment. Aristotle’s own discussion of voluntary behavior had already posited this affinity, albeit only in the case of temporal affairs.[[26]](#footnote-27) An agent is only responsible for that over which he has complete control, that is, he can bring about on his own, voluntarily.Were will**a** not *causa sui* of will**e**, the former as human agent could never be the sole author of will**c**. Given responsibility’s entailment of originative power, no appetitive agent could, then, be capable of initiating/willing**e** a series of morally significant mental acts and/or bodily movements forming an activity or project.[[27]](#footnote-28) For this reason, Anselm concurs once again with Aristotle, firmly rejecting any attempt to find a deeper explanation of volitional activity.[[28]](#footnote-29) In the case of Satan”s fall, there is said to be no other cause of his will**c** to rebel than his will**a**: hence, his complete culpability for his damnation.

It will be objected, however, that Aristotle treats efficient causes as external to that upon which they operate, viz., material causes. Agent and patient are never the same thing. But externality/internality is categorically relative, just as its logical correlate, unity. Aristotle and Anselm agree on this ontological principle.[[29]](#footnote-30) W**a** and will**d** are one in power or faculty, the former containing instances of the latter as states, but distinct as causes or principles thereof. Thus, they are external as causes while internal instrumentally: principles of a single, but multi-faceted, self-contained, self-determined system. That is to say, there is a sense in which agent and patient are one here and another one in which they are not. W**a** and will**d** are of the same faculty- they are both volition. (To be more specific, the latter is contained in the former as motivation.) Yet they are distinct as causes therein, to wit, that which actualizes versus that which is actualized: becoming one in the actualizing of will**c**. As Aristotle asserts in *On Generation and Corruption* Chapter 6, “Agent and patient are neither absolutely identical, nor sheerly distinct. They must be contrasted species of the same genus, opposed formations of the same matter.”[[30]](#footnote-31) Both causes, here, are generically volitional power; specifically they are potential versus actual will**c**, will**a** containing the latter as its form. As carpenter is carpentry in act, having in himself as skill what unformed wood lacks, but is receptive to; so will**a** may incorporate justice and happiness, as manifested in various material guises, as will**c** thereof

Returning to our explication, will**a**, as self-exercising, rational power, is free in the sense of satisfying PASC and PAP- yet, according to Anselm, there is more to the essence of freedom of the will**a** than such ability. Something by way of a *teleos* or final cause must further perfect will**a** so that becomes morally significant. That is to say, though such a power would qualify as free, given many contemporary philosopher’s tendency[[31]](#footnote-32) to reduce volitional liberty to choice and sovereignty, it would be deemed incomplete, according to Anselm, for lacking a normative element by which to morally judge it issuances- will**c**.

*Sans* a pre-deliberative, divinely infused prioritizing of the objects of will**r**,any will**c** of the will**di** of one rather than the other would be arbitrary: lack justification.[[32]](#footnote-33)And, if we are to be moral agents, praiseworthy/blameworthy for our choices, the preferred good here would obviously have to be justice. Thus, unrankedwill**r** is perfected by (its supervenient property of) being naturally more receptive to justice than happiness. That is, will**rj** is more acute than will**rh** (will**rj>**will**rh** or will**u**, for short). This innate preference is will**a**’s “rectitude” or “uprightness.”[[33]](#footnote-34) It is an object of inherent self-knowledge and, as such, the basis of conscience.

Free will, Anselm then tells us, is the will’s**a** ability to reaffirm that divinely established motivational hierarchy, thereby realizing its (divinely instilled, intellectually inherent) purpose.[[34]](#footnote-35) That is, will**a**’s freedom is its power to realize the teleological perfection itself by willing**e** will**cjij** on any occasion of will**dji** andwill**dhi**, that is, a divided will**d**. Will**cjij** is true or authenticwill**cji**,as distinguished from the appearance thereof,will**cjihi,** *a la*Plato. For Anselm, truth is use in accordance with purpose**.** Will**a**’s freedom is, thus, a form of truth. It is justice being willed**e** for its own sake, rather than instrumentally, as required bywill**u.** Thathierarchy meanswill**a** is meant to be just in itself, not as a means to its other value. Again, if ends or purposes are treated in the Aristotelian manner as being *states,[[35]](#footnote-36)* free will iswill**a** wholeheartedly willing**e,** thewill**c**,to remain in the statewill**u,** that is,in accord with its nature**.** Sin is, thus,will**ch>j** or will**cjihi**, which, as St. Anselm notes, are really the same will**c**. Either one is the nill/will**~c** of will**u.**[[36]](#footnote-37)Therefore, original sin justly resulted in human nature”s loss ofwill**u** (which Christ’s self-sacrifice miraculously restored).[[37]](#footnote-38)

A particular will**c** may be affirmed or regretted upon reflection. A decision may come to be seen retrospectively as wise or foolish**.** Will**a** is, thus, also the faculty enabling one to form one’s *character*, that part of one’s identity[[38]](#footnote-39) for which one is responsible. For consistent willingness**c** is of the commitments andprojects, as well as the intended means to securing whatever ends they entail, that morally characterize one as a person (along with the things one is routinely unwilling**c** to do). Will**a**, in sustaining the diachronic unity of our long-term activities, thus, imposes upon them the formal cause, which Aristotle denotes “habit,”[[39]](#footnote-40) that substantiates them as motivational constants.

Stabilized *via* consistent reaffirmation, character or habitisa suitable object of approbation and reprobation: virtue or vice.[[40]](#footnote-41) That is to say, will**v**isthe form or “perfection” of will**c**, made up of second-order choices or wills**c2** of wills**c,** as well as renunciations thereof (wills**c2~**, that is, wills**c2** of wills**chi** instead ofwills**cji** or vice-versa). As will**d** is the material cause of will**c**, so the latter is potential will**v.** In strengthening/attenuating will**rh/**will**rj** and, thus,will**dh/**will**dj**, will**v,** in turn,influenceswill**c,** increasing the tendency of will**a** to will**c** in conformity to its most resolute wills**c2**.Character development is, thus, will**v** andwill**c,** amplifying each other, unto personhood: moral responsibility for that part of one’s identity will**a** has brought about. The virtuous or just will**a** wills**v** will**cjj;** the wicked or unjust man fails to develop that will**c2**.

To complete our volitional hierarchy, then, we must treatwill**vjij** as having as its purpose the Beatific Vision**-** Will**vj=h.**[[41]](#footnote-42)Only in this way, can we square Anselm’s definition of free will with the Eudemonism espoused by his fellow Doctor of the Church, St. Thomas Aquinas, who rejects even the possibility of will**a** eschewing happiness. An Anselmian can accommodate this aspect of Aristotelian psychology, with which will**u** appears to be at odds, by maintaining that eternal happiness is actually the ultimate perfection of will**a.** Volition is to be exercised, in the way St. Anselm prescribes, so as to achieve the “purity of heart” receptive to moral perfection.Our ultimate end, thus, must be sought *via* the willingness**s** to forego temporal happiness should it be opposed to justice.[[42]](#footnote-43) Thus, we see further overlap between the two philosophies being discussed, since the admonition to seek happiness *via* other goods, such as moral virtue, is also to be found in Aristotle.[[43]](#footnote-44)

Thus, volition, like health and being, is analogical: a hierarchy of relatives; all causally related to a single, *relatum* that, as their essential “focus,” makes them what they are. The sharing of that entity, as essential subject and ultimate act, is the basis of its paronymic predication to them; its universality. Regular exercise is healthy because it promotes health; ditto rest, nourishment, physicians, and medicine. Will**a,** will**e,** etc. are all volition because oftheir participation inwill**vj=h**,as various causes thereof**.** But, like I AM, the apex of the analogy of being, in Whom existence is indistinct from essence, the summit of the volitional hierarchy is axiologically unified. In the divine Will, justice and happiness are, of course, one. This unity, thus, renders a corresponding virtual oneness in the Beatific Vision: obviating the distinction between will**aj** and will**ah**. Nothing attractive to one receptor is unattractive to the other; neither one is receptive to an object to which the other is averse. *Ipso facto*, the possibility of (will**dji** and will**dhi**), when (will**cji** and will**chi**)is not possible, is nullified. We shall now see what this circumstantial upgrade implies about the relationship between free will and sin.

**Free Will and Sin**

Those, like Nash-Marshall, who maintain that the ability to sin is no part of free will, are correct:[[44]](#footnote-45) The essence of free will**a** is given in Anselm”s complete definition- its being able to retain justice for its own sake- which says nothing about sinfulness. But, then, members of Church Militant, who *do* sin, either must not enjoy the same type of freedom as their saintly friends in Paradise do or not sin of their own free wills. The duality of will**r**, however, does not entail this dilemma. Instead, it means that the ability to sin is one of what medieval metaphysicians, following Aristotle, would have called free will’s “proper accidents”/”properties.” Thus, to apply one of Anselm”s own artfully drawn semantic distinction here, to say of free will that it is the ability to will**cjij** is to signify it (bring it to mind) *per se*- as it is in itself. To maintain, on the other hand, that it is also able to sin- will**ch>j**- is to signify it *per aliud*, that is, according to something inessential to, but *attendant upon*, its essence.[[45]](#footnote-46) Sin, we should say, is the *incidental,* *unnatural use* of will**a**. It is, as Aristotle would aver, a violation of its *teleos*- just like any other misuse of power. We sin of our own free wills**a** by exercising our powers of choice andmoral autonomy- necessary, but mere aspects of free will, as if they were all that there is to the faculty. (Grace, on the other hand, is not given, for anything will**a** does, a will**e,** which would be Pelagianism; but for refraining from will**ch>j,** when willing**dhi** and willing**dji.** It sustains that unwillingness**, ~**will**vh>j,** preserving will**u.**

Look at it this way: Let’s suppose that I use my expensive pen to open a door lock. Now it is obviously true that, in some sense, that object is responsible for producing said effect. But it did not bring it about as a pen *per se*; but as a pointed object: better to simply say that a pointed object was used to open the lock, specifically, a pen. Being a pen entails being able to inscribe paper, which, in turn, entails being pointed; so being a pen entails being able to open (some) locks. And while there would be nothing wrong with so using a pen in a pinch, regular such employment would be to treat it as a key, which it only is *per aliud***.**

In the same way, being a free will, that is, being a faculty able to preserve its own rectitude, entails being able to sin. For, as PAP indicates, without a dualistic conatus and self-control, there can be no temptations for a will**a** to resist, so as *preserve* its rectitude instead ofjust having it materially imposed, *via* motivational impoverishment**.** So, yes, we sin of our own free wills**a**; in fact, our sins *are* sins precisely because they are misuses of that faculty. But they are not committed by free will**a** as such, only the aspects of it that are being misused. Free will**a**, in sinning, is exercising itself as if it were a Nietzschean will-to-power.[[46]](#footnote-47) Thus, it is not acting integrally for disregarding the intellectually revealed, divinely imposed constraint placed upon its pursuit of happiness, will**u.**”

Our free will itself, as Nash-Marshall rightly insists, can and will exist in Heaven *sans* the possibility of sin, for its owners lacking the *opportunity* to offend God, as a reward for their hard-won saintliness. It does not become therein a new power, but, as established above, is afforded a fortuitous change in circumstances, viz., full**,** rather than partial, participation in the life of God.[[47]](#footnote-48) Blessedness need not involve the loss of will**rh**, to insure against sin, volitional mutilation as it were. In Paradise there must rather be only the certainty that a conflict between two wills**d** can no longer arise as the opportunityto sin.[[48]](#footnote-49) Saints will simply no longer find themselves tempted to will**e** will**ch>j** in Eternity, while still possessing the dualistic conatus that made sin possible when such an opportunity arose here in Time. Becausethere, as St. Augustine assures us, our hearts (wills**a**) will finally have rest in Him within whom justice and happiness must be one*.*[[49]](#footnote-50)

**Conclusion**

We see that St. Anselm”s definition of free will**a** is based upon the Aristotelian notion of rational appetitive power. The former, I have further shown, may be elucidated in other Aristotelian *cum* Scholastic terms. Free will**a** is self-determinative, effectively free of the past and its circumstances. It acts upon a dualistic material cause, two primal attractions. It imposes, on any occasion of its exercise, volitional form upon one of those attractions in act as desire. This exercise is, like any other generation, a reduction of potency to act. To conform to itself as will**u,** it must forego happiness, should it preclude justice, never actualizingwill**ch>j,** which, given its satisfaction of PASC, is always avoidable**.** Free will**a**is, thus, the invincible power to actualize volitional justice for its own sake, unto eternal happiness.
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