**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*

**\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_**

**Introduction**

 I demonstrate here that St. Anselm’s account 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 Eudemonism.The Beatific Vision, as *summum bonum*,is shown to be the apex of that series of perfections.[[2]](#footnote-3)I conclude by explicating Anselm’s teleological understanding of sin by reference to his semantic recapitulation 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 following the deliberations that Aristotle himself posits as antecedent to our voluntary behavior.[[4]](#footnote-5) Choices are said to be “made,” no different in this regard than alterations ensuant upon one’s bodily maturation, so the complex question must also be asked of them: from what, by what, as 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/good willed, by determining such an accidental compound’smaterial, efficient, formal and teleological causes.[[5]](#footnote-6) Seen from the perspective of Aristotle’s 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 volitional means by which one would initiate such a series of events.

Anselm, for his part, asserts that ‘will’ must be taken as having four interrelated “significates” or denotations.[[6]](#footnote-7) 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”: the substantial agent himself (will**a**) endowed, with the operational resources defined below, so as to be able to rationally determine a course of action- “will” in a second signification, will**c**,(commonly referred to as “choice”). Will**a**, thus, exerts “motive power,” posited by Aristotle in *Metaphysics* as the source of contingency in Nature.[[7]](#footnote-8) In *De Anima*,[[8]](#footnote-9) will**a** is what renders one a “human agent,” manifesting “rational, appetitive power.” Further, as the efficient cause of one’s wills**c**, will**a**engenders moral responsibility for such plans, the activities they guide, and both of their effects upon his character and the lives of others.

In serving as a will**c**’sprogenitor, will**a** performs its characteristicact, choosing/ willing**e,** that is, self-exercising so as to assume the state of reasonably preferring one intellectually determined means to an inherent objective (specified below) to another.Here we have the third, verbal, significate of ‘will’, will**a**’sself-actualization of a 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.[[9]](#footnote-10)) From this basic mental act ensues the willingness**c** to engage in one purposive course of action, instead of an alternative thereto (for reasons that subjectively justify that choice without, *eo ipso*, being its causes): the will “as its own effect.”[[10]](#footnote-11) In sum, will**a** is that power of the soul whose exercise- willing**e**- brings a will**c** into being out of (the actualizations of) ‘will’ in its fourth, axiological *cum* motivational signification: will**a**’sdivinely instilled desires **(**will**dJ** andwill**dH**) for Justice and Happiness, as states of spiritual well-being brought about by the performance of acts of various types.[[11]](#footnote-12)These necessarily innate affections form the basis of the volitional hierarchy about to be detailed.

Anselm’s argument for inherent desires is cast in Aristotelian terms: “An unactuated capacity cannot move itself to act.” Applied by Anselm to volition: “Therefore, what wills nothing cannot move itself to will.”[[12]](#footnote-13) That is, will**a** *sans* will**d** would be unable to will**e**. Thus, attractionsmust be instilled in will**a**. A volitional *teleos*, **as** Aristotle understood as well, cannot be chosen; since choice, by its very nature, is between means to a *given* end.[[13]](#footnote-14) (We note in passing another remnant of Aristotelianism: immanent realism regarding universals: Justice and Happiness, analogically present in the sorts of actions realized to be effective thereunto.[[14]](#footnote-15))

The genus will**d**, is said by Anselm, to be “actuate(d)” with “determinate volition(s)” by (its) receptivity to intellectually proffered means of securing Justice and Happiness.[[15]](#footnote-16) The source of will**a**’s activity is, thus, its actualization as the inclinations will**ihm** and will**ijm.** That is, will**i**, as affinity to purposive activity, is will**a**‘s potential readiness to pursue the objects ofwill**dH** andwill**dJ –** *via* intellectually determined courses of action**.** Thus, will**i** may be construed, as a passive capacity, *a la* the Intellect in the case of perceptual universals**.** Ensconced volitionally, an axiological universal becomes the willingness**i** to execute a specific means thereto. Will**ihm** /will**ijm** is, thus,will**dH** / will**dJ** perfected.

Anselm deemed a dualistic conatus a prerequisite of moral responsibility for one’s wills**c** and ensuing actions and whatever effects the latter, in turn, cause.[[16]](#footnote-17) His insistence upon an axiological distinction within will**d** makes him an early, medieval proponent of what is now known as the Principle of Alternative Possibilities (PAP):[[17]](#footnote-18) an agent, to qualify as either praiseworthy or blameworthy, must be able to will**d** distinct types of goods.[[18]](#footnote-19) Were we incapable of simultaneously willing**i** to means to both Happiness and Justice, willing**d** 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 capacity to will**d** dichotomous axiological alternatives is, thus, deemed by Anselm a prerequisite of moral agency.

 By extension, a will**a**, who has had his *character* bestowed upon him by His Creator, in the form of a monistic will**d**, 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. But, were we only receptive to Happiness, we couldn’t help but being egoists. On the other hand, we would be axiologically determined to be virtuous *sans* a sense of our own well-being. And the satisfaction of the desire to be responsible for one’s character is necessary aspect of human freedom.[[19]](#footnote-20)

Deliberative dissonance signals a challenge for will**a** to meet on its own- a self-induced problem to resolve for credit- requiring it to nill**e** acts unattractive from the perspective of one of its wills**i** in order to retain its own integrity: wholeheartedness. The material cause of meritorious willing**e** could only be morally significant volitional impassewithin will**i**- will**2**, that is, contemporaneous wills**i** mutually exclusive as wills**c**,one of which is teleologically obligatory (as specified below). It is, then, a virtue of will**a** that it can stand in need of self-adjudication. 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 of will**d**’s objects is what makes will**a** a fit object of approbation / reprobation.[[20]](#footnote-21) For our edification, Anselm presents along these lines the case of a man agonizing over lying or being executed: a will**a** struggling to bring himself towill**e** thewill**cjm** (telling the truth) while also willing**ihm** something incompatible thereto (to lie).[[21]](#footnote-22)

To reformulate, then, inlight of this dualistic understanding of motivation, Anselm’s third, active sense of ‘will’: will**e** is the reduction of will**ihm** / will**ijm to** will**chm** /will**cjm**. That is, will**a**’s characteristic act is the application of the form willingness**c** to (the matter that is) one of its wills**i**. In performing it, will**a** becomes either will**chm** orwill**cjm**. Will**e** satisfiesPAP because every will**chm** is *ipso facto*will**chm1 rather than / > hm2** orwill**chm>jm** andeverywill**cjm** is *ipso facto*will**cjm>hm,** orwill**cjm1>jm2**.[[22]](#footnote-23) We can safely ignore these elaborations here except, as we shall see, in the case of will**cjm>hm**. To answer, then, three of the four questions posed above, will**a** functions as the mental analog of, as Aristotle puts it, “a man in begetting his children”: willing**e** a will**cjm /** will**chm** out ofa will**ijm /** will**ihm**.[[23]](#footnote-24)

*Sans* such a reduction of itself, will**a** must remain intentionally undetermined, regardless of the strength of any will**i**. Until such time as will**a** terminates deliberation by willing**e**, it remains contingent what it will become as will**c**. Will**a**, thus, completely controls itself, no other power or agent can cause it to will**e** will**i** should it be unwilling**e** to do so on its own. Anselm is rightly adamant that should an agent be overcome by a particular temptation, the fault cannot lie in his volitional nature, which renders him morally indomitable.[[24]](#footnote-25) On the contrary, the cause of sin (as teleologically explicated above) could only be his failure to *fully exercise* his/will**a**’s absolute authority over will**ihm**: in a word, persevere in his will**cjm**. It is always an avoidable, self-induced, precipitous willing**e** of an illicit will**i**that leads to moral failure:[[25]](#footnote-26) e.g., deceit, in the case of the fraud. Deliberation also only yields a ranking of courses of action, according to their conduciveness to the objects of will**d**. The actual imposition of will**c**upon any one of them- willing**e**it- is solely the prerogative of will**a**. Even Grace, given that it is a gift- will**djmG**- would have to be inefficacious until assimilated by will**a**asawill**c** thereof (though irresistible as such in subsequent agency- that is, as motivation to will**e** and execute other wills**ijm**).[[26]](#footnote-27)

Rational, self-caused reduction of will**ihm** /will**ijm** to will**chm** /will**cjm**- willing**e**- is the “basic act,” sought by Arthur Danto and other philosophers, from which ultimate responsibility, for resulting neural processes, bodily movements, activities and the consequences thereof, is, thus, derived.[[27]](#footnote-28) Its performance- will**e**- renders will**a** an unmoved mover. Call this understanding of volitional autonomy the Principle of Absolute Self-Control/PASC.[[28]](#footnote-29) Vesting this originative power in agents themselves, rather than mental events of which they are merely subjects, makes Anselm, in contemporary philosophical terms, an “agent-causalist,” which, as alluded to above, is yet another element of Aristotle’s philosophical psychology.[[29]](#footnote-30)

 As with cognition, in will**i** there is accidental identification of a particular mind and a universal of which it is a (mental) instance. 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.[[30]](#footnote-31) 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 willing**e**, the former as human agent could never be the sole author of a will**c**. Given responsibility’s entailment of originative power, no appetitive agent could, then fail to be capable of initiating/willing**e** a series of morally significant mental acts and/or bodily movements forming an activity or project.[[31]](#footnote-32) For this reason, Anselm concurs once again with Aristotle, firmly rejecting any attempt to find a deeper explanation of volitional activity.[[32]](#footnote-33) 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.[[33]](#footnote-34)

 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.[[34]](#footnote-35) Will**a** and will**i** are one in power or faculty, the former receiving 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. Will**a** and will**i** are of the same faculty- they are both volition. (To be more specific, the latter is manifests 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: “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.”[[35]](#footnote-36) 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 incorporatevarious means, to achieving the objects of its basic desires, as wills**c** thereof.

 Returning to our explication, will**a**, as self-exercising, rational power, is free in the sense of satisfying PASC and PAP. But, 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 the faculty becomes morally significant. That is to say, though such a power would qualify as free, given many contemporary philosophers’ tendency[[36]](#footnote-37) 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- wills**c**.

*Sans* a pre-deliberative, divinely infused prioritizing of the objects of will**d**,any will**c** of the will**i** of one of those values, rather than the other, would be arbitrary: lack justification.[[37]](#footnote-38)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**d** is perfected by (its supervenient property of) being naturally more attracted to Justice than Happiness. That is, will**dJ** is more acute than will**dH** (will**dJ>**will**dH** or will**u**, for short). This innate preference is will**a**’s “rectitude” or “uprightness.”[[38]](#footnote-39) It is an object of inherent self-knowledge and, as such, the basis of conscience: surety of obligation.

Free will, Anselm then tells us, is the will’s**a** ability to reaffirm that divinely established motivational hierarchy, thereby realizing its (divinely instilled, readily apprehended) purpose.[[39]](#footnote-40) That is, will**a**’s freedom is its power to realize the teleological perfection of itself by willing**e** will**cjm**$ \rightarrow $**J** on any occasion of will**i**. Will**cjm**$ \rightarrow $**J** is true or authenticwill**cjm**,as distinguished from the appearance thereof,will**cjm**$ \rightarrow $**H**. For Anselm, truth is use in accordance with purpose**.** Will**a**’s freedom is, thus, a form of truth. It is justice being willed**e** for its own sake, rather than instrumentally, as required bywill**u.** Thathierarchy meanswill**a** is meant to be just in himself, not as a means to its other value. The self-actualization of this self-perfection (with the necessary, yet mysterious, help of will**djmG**) is the state of volitional rectitude or free will. Will**cjm**$ \rightarrow $**J** iswill**a** wholeheartedly willing**e,** thewill**c**,to abide in the statewill**u,** that is,in accord with one’s axiological nature**.** Sin is, thus,will**chm>j** or will**cjm**$ \rightarrow $**h**, which, as St. Anselm notes, are really the same will**c**. Either one is the nill/will**~c** of will**u.**[[40]](#footnote-41)Therefore, original sin justly resulted in human nature’s loss ofwill**u** (which Christ’s Crucifixion restored).[[41]](#footnote-42)

A particular will**c** may be affirmed or regretted upon reflection. Decisions often come to be viewed 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[[42]](#footnote-43) for which one is responsible. For it is *consistent* willing**e** of specific wills**im** that eventually renders will**a** a certain type of person (along with the wills**im** he routinely nills**e**): the author of his volitionally inherent tendencies.Will**a**, in thus establishing and sustaining the diachronic unity of such evaluative commitments, imposes upon them the formal cause Aristotle terms ‘habit’,[[43]](#footnote-44) which substantiates them as motivational constants.

Stabilized *via* prolonged reaffirmation, character or habitbecomesa suitable object of approbation and reprobation: virtue or vice/will**v**.[[44]](#footnote-45) Will**v**isthe form or “perfection” of will**c**, made up of second-order choices or wills**c2** of wills**c,** as well as nills**c**2 thereof (that is, wills**c2** of wills**chm** instead of wills**cjm**or vice-versa). As will**i** is the material cause of will**c**, so the latter is potential will**v.** In strengthening/attenuating will**dH /** will**dJ** and, thus,will**ihm /** will**ijm**, will**v,** in turn,influenceswill**c,** increasing the tendency of will**a** to will**e** in conformity to one’s 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**cj**$ \rightarrow $**j;** the wicked or unjust man fails to develop that will**c2**.

To complete our volitional hierarchy, then, we must treatwill**vjm**$ \rightarrow $**J,** the purpose ofwill**a**, as having as *its* end the Beatific Vision**-** Will**bJ=H.**[[45]](#footnote-46)Only through teleological gradation, can we square Anselm’s definition of free will with the Aristotelian Eudemonism espoused by his fellow Doctor of the Church, St. Thomas Aquinas, who (rightly) rejects the possibility of will**a** eschewing happiness. An Anselmian can accommodate this aspect of Aristotelian *cum* Thomistic axiology, with which attaching paramount importance to will**u** maintenancemight appear to be at odds, by positing the Beatific Vision as the ultimate perfection of will**a**, the potency of which is will**vjm**$ \rightarrow $**J**.Volition is to be exercised, in the way St. Anselm prescribes, so as to achieve the “purity of heart” receptive to moral perfection.Our ultimate end, thus, must be sought *via* the willingness**v** to forego temporal happiness should it be opposed to justice.[[46]](#footnote-47) Here we have further overlap between the two philosophies being discussed, since the admonition to seek happiness *via* other goods, such as moral virtue, always a struggle to acquire, is also to be found in Aristotle.[[47]](#footnote-48) Having disambiguated ‘will’, we can see that neither a dualistic conatus nor Justice ranking Happiness is inconsistent with Eudemonism. Will**a** willing**e** willing**vjm**$ \rightarrow $**J** leaves volition oriented to Happiness: yet the object of both will**rhm** and Will**bJ=H**. There is no nilling of Happiness here; only the rejection of a particular means thereto. Detours are not deviations.

That there are degrees of volition means that it is “analogical,” *a la* being, which is also graded: a hierarchy of relatives; all causally related to a single, *relatum* that, as their essential “focus,” makes them what they are (as in the case of bodily health and all the signs and facilitators thereof).[[48]](#footnote-49) The latter’s sharing of that entity, as essential subject and ultimate act, is the basis of paronymic predication thereto; its universality. Regular exercise is healthy because it promotes health; ditto rest, nourishment, physicians, and medicine. Will**d,** will**e,** etc. are all volition because oftheir participation inWill**bJ=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 one. This unity, thus, renders a corresponding virtual oneness in the Beatific Vision: obviating the distinction between will**ijm** and will**ihm**. 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**2**, 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:[[49]](#footnote-50) 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, it seems that sinners either must not enjoy the same type of freedom as their saintly friends in Paradise do or not transgress morality of their own free wills. Nash-Marshall, denying the left-disjunct here, maintains that we mistakenly posit PAP satisfaction as a necessary condition upon a free agency: **“**that choice and alternate possible courses of action are necessary requisites of freedom, presupposes that there can be no such thing as a perfect(ly) free being ... (that we should) not define freedom through a perfect instance of freedom: the freedom of a perfect rational being.”[[50]](#footnote-51) But, as noted above, in defining will**d**, clearly Anselm *is* concerned to explicate human freedom, the type an agent must strive to avoid losing to sin, in order to gain will**vj=h**, precisely because of his imperfect, fallen nature and circumstances. The struggle to preserve will**u** means that our place in Eternity, in relation to Perfect Freedom, will have been earned, not arbitrarily bestowed. Heaven and Hell make no sense *sans* moral responsibility, which, in turn, requires the ability to do otherwise. An agent cannot justifiably be punished or rewarded for his actions unless they were performed instead of other courses of conduct that he might have taken.[[51]](#footnote-52)

The duality of will**d** does not, moreover, entail the above 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**cjm**$ \rightarrow $**J** 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**cihm>ijm**- is to reference it *per aliud*, that is, according to something inessential to, but *attendant upon*, its essence.[[52]](#footnote-53) Sin, we should say, is the *incidental,* *unnatural* will**e** of will**a**. It is, as Aristotle would aver, a violation of its *teleos*- just like any other misuse of power. Will**a** sins/wills**cihm>ijm** by treating its sovereignty and dualistic conatus- necessary, but mere instrumental aspects of free will, as if they were all that there is to its nature, disregarding its purpose.That is, moral wrongdoing is avoidable self-debasement: the failure to preserve will**u** by willing**cijm>ihm** (on occasion of a will2).

 Look at it this way: Let’s suppose that I use my 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 and PASC entail, without a dualistic conatus and self-control, there can be no temptations for a will**a** to resist, so as *maintain* 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.[[53]](#footnote-54) 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.[[54]](#footnote-55) Blessedness need not involve the loss of will**dH**, 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.[[55]](#footnote-56) Saints will simply no longer find themselves tempted to will**e** the will**chm>ijm** in Eternity, while still possessing the dualistic conatus that made sin possible when will**2** arose in their lives on Earth. Becausethere, as St. Augustine assures us, our hearts (wills**a**) will finally have rest in Him within whom justice and happiness must be one*.*[[56]](#footnote-57)

**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. Human agency is based upon two primal attractions. Will**a** imposes, in, self-exercise, volitional form, choice, upon the passive actualization of one of those desires, as an inclination to seek its object *via* an intellectually determined means thereto. This exercise is, like any other generation, a reduction of potency to act. To self-conform to will**u**,remaining free,will**a** must forego any action promising Happiness, should it preclude doing Justice, never actualizingwill**chm>ijm,** which, given its satisfaction of PASC, is always avoidable**.** Free will**a**is, thus, the invincible power to choose to preserve will**u** for its own sake, unto eternal Happiness. Sin, on the other hand, is the perditious nill**c** thereof.
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