

St. Thomas Aquinas

The Summa Theologica

(Benziger Bros. edition, 1947)
Translated by
Fathers of the English Dominican Province

OF THE SUBJECT OF VIRTUE (SIX ARTICLES)

Deinde considerandum est de subiecto virtutis. Et circa hoc quaeruntur sex.

We now have to consider the subject of virtue, about which there are six points of inquiry:

Primo, utrum virtus sit in potentia animae sicut in subiecto.

(1) Whether the subject of virtue is a power of the soul?

Secundo, utrum una virtus possit esse in pluribus potentiis.

(2) Whether one virtue can be in several powers?

Tertio, utrum intellectus possit esse subiectum virtutis.

(3) Whether the intellect can be the subject of virtue?

Quarto, utrum irascibilis et concupiscibilis.

(4) Whether the irascible and concupiscible faculties can be the subject of virtue?

Quinto, utrum vires apprehensivae sensitivae.

(5) Whether the sensitive powers of apprehension can be the subject of virtue?

Sexto, utrum voluntas.

(6) Whether the will can be the subject of virtue?

Whether the subject of virtue is a power of the soul?

Ad primum sic proceditur. Videtur quod virtus non sit in potentia animae sicut in subiecto. Dicit enim Augustinus, in II de Lib. Arbit., quod virtus est qua recte vivitur. Vivere autem non est per potentiam animae, sed per eius essentiam. Ergo virtus non est in

Objection 1: It would seem that the subject of virtue is not a power of the soul. For Augustine says (De Lib. Arb. ii, 19) that "virtue is that by which we live righteously." But we live by the essence of the soul, and not by a power of the soul. Therefore virtue is not a power, but in the

potentia animae, sed in eius essentia.

Praeterea, philosophus dicit, in II Ethic., virtus est quae bonum facit habentem, et opus eius bonum reddit. Sed sicut opus constituitur per potentiam, ita habens virtutem constituitur per essentiam animae. Ergo virtus non magis pertinet ad potentiam animae, quam ad eius essentiam.

Praeterea, potentia est in secunda specie qualitatis. Virtus autem est quaedam qualitas, ut supra dictum est. Qualitatis autem non est qualitas. Ergo virtus non est in potentia animae sicut in subiecto.

Sed contra, virtus est ultimum potentiae, ut dicitur in I de caelo. Sed ultimum est in eo cuius est ultimum. Ergo virtus est in potentia animae.

Respondeo dicendum quod virtutem pertinere ad potentiam animae, ex tribus potest esse manifestum. Primo quidem, ex ipsa ratione virtutis, quae importat perfectionem potentiae, perfectio autem est in eo cuius est perfectio. Secundo, ex hoc quod est habitus operativus, ut supra dictum est, omnis autem operatio est ab anima per aliquam potentiam. Tertio, ex hoc quod disponit ad optimum, optimum autem est finis, qui vel est operatio rei, vel aliquid consecutum per operationem a potentia egredientem. Unde virtus humana est in potentia animae sicut in subiecto.

Ad primum ergo dicendum quod vivere dupliciter sumitur. Quandoque enim dicitur vivere ipsum esse viventis, et sic pertinet ad essentiam animae, quae est viventi essendi principium. Alio modo vivere dicitur operatio viventis, et sic virtute recte vivitur, inquantum per eam aliquis recte operatur.

essence of the soul.

Objection 2: Further, the Philosopher says (Ethic. ii, 6) that "virtue is that which makes its possessor good, and his work good likewise." But as work is set up by power, so he that has a virtue is set up by the essence of the soul. Therefore virtue does not belong to the power, any more than to the essence of the soul.

Objection 3: Further, power is in the second species of quality. But virtue is a quality, as we have said above ([Question \[55\]](#), [Article \[4\]](#)): and quality is not the subject of quality. Therefore a power of the soul is not the subject of virtue.

On the contrary, "Virtue is the limit of power" (De Coelo ii). But the limit is in that of which it is the limit. Therefore virtue is in a power of the soul.

I answer that, It can be proved in three ways that virtue belongs to a power of the soul. First, from the notion of the very essence of virtue, which implies perfection of a power; for perfection is in that which it perfects. Secondly, from the fact that virtue is an operative habit, as we have said above ([Question \[55\]](#), [Article \[2\]](#)): for all operation proceeds from the soul through a power. Thirdly, from the fact that virtue disposes to that which is best: for the best is the end, which is either a thing's operation, or something acquired by an operation proceeding from the thing's power. Therefore a power of the soul is the subject of virtue.

Reply to Objection 1: "To live" may be taken in two ways. Sometimes it is taken for the very existence of the living thing: in this way it belongs to the essence of the soul, which is the principle of existence in the living thing. But sometimes "to live" is taken for the operation of the living thing: in this sense, by virtue we live righteously, inasmuch as by virtue we perform

righteous actions.

Ad secundum dicendum quod bonum vel est finis, vel in ordine ad finem dicitur. Et ideo, cum bonum operantis consistat in operatione, hoc etiam ipsum quod virtus facit operantem bonum, refertur ad operationem, et per consequens ad potentiam.

Ad tertium dicendum quod unum accidens dicitur esse in alio sicut in subiecto, non quia accidens per seipsum possit sustentare aliud accidens, sed quia unum accidens inhaeret substantiae mediante alio accidente, ut color corpori mediante superficie; unde superficies dicitur esse subiectum coloris. Et eo modo potentia animae dicitur esse subiectum virtutis.

Reply to Objection 2: Good is either the end, or something referred to the end. And therefore, since the good of the worker consists in the work, this fact also, that virtue makes the worker good, is referred to the work, and consequently, to the power.

Reply to Objection 3: One accident is said to be the subject of another, not as though one accident could uphold another; but because one accident inheres to substance by means of another, as color to the body by means of the surface; so that surface is said to be the subject of color. In this way a power of the soul is said to be the subject of virtue.

Whether one virtue can be in several powers?

Ad secundum sic proceditur. Videtur quod una virtus possit esse in duabus potentiis. Habitus enim cognoscuntur per actus. Sed unus actus progreditur diversimode a diversis potentiis, sicut ambulatio procedit a ratione ut a dirigente, a voluntate sicut a movente, et a potentia motiva sicut ab exequente. Ergo etiam unus habitus virtutis potest esse in pluribus potentiis.

Praeterea, philosophus dicit, in II Ethic., quod ad virtutem tria requiruntur, scilicet scire, velle et immobiliter operari. Sed scire pertinet ad intellectum, velle ad voluntatem. Ergo virtus potest esse in pluribus potentiis.

Praeterea, prudentia est in ratione, cum sit recta ratio agibilium, ut dicitur in VI Ethic. Est etiam in voluntate, quia non potest esse cum voluntate perversa, ut in eodem libro dicitur.

Objection 1: It would seem that one virtue can be in several powers. For habits are known by their acts. But one act proceeds in various way from several powers: thus walking proceeds from the reason as directing, from the will as moving, and from the motive power as executing. Therefore also one habit can be in several powers.

Objection 2: Further, the Philosopher says (Ethic. ii, 4) that three things are required for virtue, namely: "to know, to will, and to work steadfastly." But "to know" belongs to the intellect, and "to will" belongs to the will. Therefore virtue can be in several powers.

Objection 3: Further, prudence is in the reason since it is "the right reason of things to be done" (Ethic. vi, 5). And it is also in the will: for it cannot exist together with a perverse

Ergo una virtus potest esse in duabus potentiis.

Sed contra, virtus est in potentia animae sicut in subiecto. Sed idem accidens non potest esse in pluribus subiectis. Ergo una virtus non potest esse in pluribus potentiis animae.

Respondeo dicendum quod aliquid esse in duobus, contingit dupliciter. Uno modo, sic quod ex aequo sit in utroque. Et sic impossibile est unam virtutem esse in duabus potentiis, quia diversitas potentiarum attenditur secundum generales conditiones obiectorum, diversitas autem habituum secundum speciales; unde ubicumque est diversitas potentiarum, est diversitas habituum, sed non convertitur. Alio modo potest esse aliquid in duobus vel pluribus, non ex aequo, sed ordine quodam. Et sic una virtus pertinere potest ad plures potentias; ita quod in una sit principaliter, et se extendat ad alias per modum diffusionis, vel per modum dispositionis; secundum quod una potentia movetur ab alia, et secundum quod una potentia accipit ab alia.

Ad primum ergo dicendum quod idem actus non potest aequaliter, et eodem ordine, pertinere ad diversas potentias, sed secundum diversas rationes, et diverso ordine.

Ad secundum dicendum quod scire praexigitur ad virtutem moralem, inquantum virtus moralis operatur secundum rationem rectam. Sed essentialiter in appetendo virtus moralis consistit.

Ad tertium dicendum quod prudentia realiter est in ratione sicut in subiecto, sed praesupponit rectitudinem voluntatis sicut principium, ut infra dicitur.

will (Ethic. vi, 12). Therefore one virtue can be in two powers.

On the contrary, The subject of virtue is a power of the soul. But the same accident cannot be in several subjects. Therefore one virtue cannot be in several powers of the soul.

I answer that, It happens in two ways that one thing is subjected in two. First, so that it is in both on an equal footing. In this way it is impossible for one virtue to be in two powers: since diversity of powers follows the generic conditions of the objects, while diversity of habits follows the specific conditions thereof: and so wherever there is diversity of powers, there is diversity of habits; but not vice versa. In another way one thing can be subjected in two or more, not on an equal footing, but in a certain order. And thus one virtue can belong to several powers, so that it is in one chiefly, while it extends to others by a kind of diffusion, or by way of a disposition, in so far as one power is moved by another, and one power receives from another.

Reply to Objection 1: One act cannot belong to several powers equally, and in the same degree; but only from different points of view, and in various degrees.

Reply to Objection 2: "To know" is a condition required for moral virtue, inasmuch as moral virtue works according to right reason. But moral virtue is essentially in the appetite.

Reply to Objection 3: Prudence is really subjected in reason: but it presupposes as its principle the rectitude of the will, as we shall see further on ([Article \[3\]](#); [Question \[57\]](#), [Article \[4\]](#)).

Whether the intellect can be the subject of virtue?

Ad tertium sic proceditur. Videtur quod intellectus non sit subiectum virtutis. Dicit enim Augustinus, in libro de moribus Eccles., quod omnis virtus est amor. Subiectum autem amoris non est intellectus, sed solum vis appetitiva. Ergo nulla virtus est in intellectu.

Praeterea, virtus ordinatur ad bonum, sicut ex supradictis patet. Bonum autem non est obiectum intellectus, sed appetitivae virtutis. Ergo subiectum virtutis non est intellectus, sed appetitiva virtus.

Praeterea, virtus est quae bonum facit habentem, ut philosophus dicit. Sed habitus perficiens intellectum non facit bonum habentem, non enim propter scientiam vel artem dicitur homo bonus. Ergo intellectus non est subiectum virtutis.

Sed contra est quod mens maxime dicitur intellectus. Subiectum autem virtutis est mens; ut patet ex definitione virtutis supra inducta. Ergo intellectus est subiectum virtutis.

Respondeo dicendum quod, sicut supra dictum est, virtus est habitus quo quis bene operatur. Dupliciter autem habitus aliquis ordinatur ad bonum actum. Uno modo, inquantum per huiusmodi habitum acquiritur homini facultas ad bonum actum, sicut per habitum grammaticae habet homo facultatem recte loquendi. Non tamen grammatica facit ut homo semper recte loquatur, potest enim grammaticus barbarizare aut soloecismum facere. Et eadem ratio est in aliis scientiis et artibus. Alio modo, aliquis habitus non solum facit

Objection 1: It would seem that the intellect is not the subject of virtue. For Augustine says (De Moribus Eccl. xv) that all virtue is love. But the subject of love is not the intellect, but the appetitive power alone. Therefore no virtue is in the intellect.

Objection 2: Further, virtue is referred to good, as is clear from what has been said above ([Question \[55\]](#), [Article \[3\]](#)). Now good is not the object of the intellect, but of the appetitive power. Therefore the subject of virtue is not the intellect, but the appetitive power.

Objection 3: Further, virtue is that "which makes its possessor good," as the Philosopher says (Ethic. ii, 6). But the habit which perfects the intellect does not make its possessor good: since a man is not said to be a good man on account of his science or his art. Therefore the intellect is not the subject of virtue.

On the contrary, The mind is chiefly called the intellect. But the subject of virtue is the mind, as is clear from the definition, above given, of virtue ([Question \[55\]](#), [Article \[4\]](#)). Therefore the intellect is the subject of virtue.

I answer that, As we have said above ([Question \[55\]](#), [Article \[3\]](#)), a virtue is a habit by which we work well. Now a habit may be directed to a good act in two ways. First, in so far as by the habit a man acquires an aptness to a good act; for instance, by the habit of grammar man has the aptness to speak correctly. But grammar does not make a man always speak correctly: for a grammarian may be guilty of a barbarism or make a solecism: and the case is the same with other sciences and arts. Secondly, a habit may confer not only aptness to act, but also the right use of that aptness: for instance, justice not only

facultatem agendi, sed etiam facit quod aliquis recte facultate utatur, sicut iustitia non solum facit quod homo sit promptae voluntatis ad iusta operandum, sed etiam facit ut iuste operetur.

Et quia bonum, sicut et ens, non dicitur simpliciter aliquid secundum id quod est in potentia, sed secundum id quod est in actu; ideo ab huiusmodi habitibus simpliciter dicitur homo bonum operari, et esse bonus, puta quia est iustus vel temperatus; et eadem ratio est de similibus. Et quia virtus est quae bonum facit habentem, et opus eius bonum reddit, huiusmodi habitus simpliciter dicuntur virtutes, quia reddunt bonum opus in actu, et simpliciter faciunt bonum habentem. Primi vero habitus non simpliciter dicuntur virtutes, quia non reddunt bonum opus nisi in quadam facultate, nec simpliciter faciunt bonum habentem. Non enim dicitur simpliciter aliquis homo bonus, ex hoc quod est sciens vel artifex, sed dicitur bonus solum secundum quid, puta bonus grammaticus, aut bonus faber. Et propter hoc, plerumque scientia et ars contra virtutem dividitur, quandoque autem virtutes dicuntur, ut patet in VI Ethic.

Subiectum igitur habitus qui secundum quid dicitur virtus, potest esse intellectus, non solum practicus, sed etiam intellectus speculativus, absque omni ordine ad voluntatem, sic enim philosophus, in VI Ethic., scientiam, sapientiam et intellectum, et etiam artem, ponit esse intellectuales virtutes. Subiectum vero habitus qui simpliciter dicitur virtus, non potest esse nisi voluntas; vel aliqua potentia secundum quod est mota a voluntate. Cuius ratio est, quia voluntas movet omnes alias potentias quae aequaliter sunt rationales, ad suos actus, ut supra habitum est, et ideo quod homo actu bene agat, contingit ex hoc quod homo habet bonam voluntatem. Unde

gives man the prompt will to do just actions, but also makes him act justly.

And since good, and, in like manner, being, is said of a thing simply, in respect, not of what it is potentially, but of what it is actually: therefore from having habits of the latter sort, man is said simply to do good, and to be good; for instance, because he is just, or temperate; and in like manner as regards other such virtues. And since virtue is that "which makes its possessor good, and his work good likewise," these latter habits are called virtuous simply: because they make the work to be actually good, and the subject good simply. But the first kind of habits are not called virtues simply: because they do not make the work good except in regard to a certain aptness, nor do they make their possessor good simply. For through being gifted in science or art, a man is said to be good, not simply, but relatively; for instance, a good grammarian or a good smith. And for this reason science and art are often divided against virtue; while at other times they are called virtues (Ethic. vi, 2).

Hence the subject of a habit which is called a virtue in a relative sense, can be the intellect, and not only the practical intellect, but also the speculative, without any reference to the will: for thus the Philosopher (Ethic. vi, 3) holds that science, wisdom and understanding, and also art, are intellectual virtues. But the subject of a habit which is called a virtue simply, can only be the will, or some power in so far as it is moved by the will. And the reason of this is, that the will moves to their acts all those other powers that are in some way rational, as we have said above ([Question \[9\]](#), [Article \[1\]](#); [Question \[17\]](#), [Articles \[1\].5](#); [FP](#), [Question \[82\]](#), [Article \[4\]](#)): and therefore if man do well actually, this is because he has a good will. Therefore the virtue which

virtus quae facit bene agere in actu, non solum in facultate, oportet quod vel sit in ipsa voluntate; vel in aliqua potentia secundum quod est a voluntate mota.

Contingit autem intellectum a voluntate moveri, sicut et alias potentias, considerat enim aliquis aliquid actu, eo quod vult. Et ideo intellectus, secundum quod habet ordinem ad voluntatem, potest esse subiectum virtutis simpliciter dictae. Et hoc modo intellectus speculativus, vel ratio, est subiectum fidei, movetur enim intellectus ad assentiendum his quae sunt fidei, ex imperio voluntatis; nullus enim credit nisi volens. Intellectus vero practicus est subiectum prudentiae. Cum enim prudentia sit recta ratio agibilium, requiritur ad prudentiam quod homo se bene habeat ad principia huius rationis agendorum, quae sunt fines; ad quos bene se habet homo per rectitudinem voluntatis, sicut ad principia speculabilium per naturale lumen intellectus agentis. Et ideo sicut subiectum scientiae, quae est ratio recta speculabilium, est intellectus speculativus in ordine ad intellectum agentem; ita subiectum prudentiae est intellectus practicus in ordine ad voluntatem rectam.

Ad primum ergo dicendum quod verbum Augustini intelligendum est de virtute simpliciter dicta non quod omnis talis virtus sit simpliciter amor; sed quia dependet aliquantulum ab amore, inquantum dependet a voluntate, cuius prima affectio est amor, ut supra dictum est.

Ad secundum dicendum quod bonum uniuscuiusque est finis eius, et ideo, cum verum sit finis intellectus, cognoscere verum est bonus actus intellectus. Unde habitus perficiens intellectum ad verum

makes a man to do well actually, and not merely to have the aptness to do well, must be either in the will itself; or in some power as moved by the will.

Now it happens that the intellect is moved by the will, just as are the other powers: for a man considers something actually, because he wills to do so. And therefore the intellect, in so far as it is subordinate to the will, can be the subject of virtue absolutely so called. And in this way the speculative intellect, or the reason, is the subject of Faith: for the intellect is moved by the command of the will to assent to what is of faith: for "no man believeth, unless he will" [*Augustine: Tract. xxvi in Joan.]. But the practical intellect is the subject of prudence. For since prudence is the right reason of things to be done, it is a condition thereof that man be rightly disposed in regard to the principles of this reason of things to be done, that is in regard to their ends, to which man is rightly disposed by the rectitude of the will, just as to the principles of speculative truth he is rightly disposed by the natural light of the active intellect. And therefore as the subject of science, which is the right reason of speculative truths, is the speculative intellect in its relation to the active intellect, so the subject of prudence is the practical intellect in its relation to the right will.

Reply to Objection 1: The saying of Augustine is to be understood of virtue simply so called: not that every virtue is love simply: but that it depends in some way on love, in so far as it depends on the will, whose first movement consists in love, as we have said above ([Question \[25\]](#), [Articles \[1\], 2, 3](#); [Question \[27\]](#), [Article \[4\]](#); [FP](#), [Question \[20\]](#), [Article \[1\]](#)).

Reply to Objection 2: The good of each thing is its end: and therefore, as truth is the end of the intellect, so to know truth is the good act of the intellect. Whence the habit, which perfects the intellect in regard to the knowledge of truth,

cognoscendum, vel in speculativis vel in practicis, dicitur virtus.

whether speculative or practical, is a virtue.

Ad tertium dicendum quod ratio illa procedit de virtute simpliciter dicta.

Reply to Objection 3: This objection considers virtue simply so called.

Whether the irascible and concupiscible powers are the subject of virtue?

Ad quartum sic proceditur. Videtur quod irascibilis et concupiscibilis non possint esse subiectum virtutis. Huiusmodi enim vires sunt communes nobis et brutis. Sed nunc loquimur de virtute secundum quod est propria homini, sic enim dicitur virtus humana. Non igitur humanae virtutis potest esse subiectum irascibilis et concupiscibilis, quae sunt partes appetitus sensitivi, ut in primo dictum est.

Objection 1: It would seem that the irascible and concupiscible powers cannot be the subject of virtue. For these powers are common to us and dumb animals. But we are now speaking of virtue as proper to man, since for this reason it is called human virtue. It is therefore impossible for human virtue to be in the irascible and concupiscible powers which are parts of the sensitive appetite, as we have said in the FP, Question [81], Article [2].

Praeterea, appetitus sensitivus est vis utens organo corporali. Sed bonum virtutis non potest esse in corpore hominis, dicit enim apostolus, Rom. VII, scio quod non habitat in carne mea bonum. Ergo appetitus sensitivus non potest esse subiectum virtutis.

Objection 2: Further, the sensitive appetite is a power which makes use of a corporeal organ. But the good of virtue cannot be in man's body: for the Apostle says ([Rm. 7](#)): "I know that good does not dwell in my flesh." Therefore the sensitive appetite cannot be the subject of virtue.

Praeterea, Augustinus probat, in libro de moribus Eccles., quod virtus non est in corpore, sed in anima, eo quod per animam corpus regitur, unde quod aliquis corpore bene utatur, totum refertur ad animam; sicut si mihi auriga obtemperans, equos quibus praeest, recte regit, hoc totum mihi debetur. Sed sicut anima regit corpus, ita etiam ratio regit appetitum sensitivum. Ergo totum rationali parti debetur, quod irascibilis et concupiscibilis recte regantur. Sed virtus est qua recte vivitur, ut supra dictum est. Virtus igitur non est in irascibili et concupiscibili, sed solum in parte rationali.

Praeterea, principalis actus virtutis moralis est electio, ut dicitur in VIII Ethic. Sed electio non est actus irascibilis et concupiscibilis, sed rationis, ut supra dictum est. Ergo virtus moralis non est in irascibili et concupiscibili, sed in ratione.

Sed contra est quod fortitudo ponitur esse in irascibili, temperantia autem in concupiscibili. Unde philosophus dicit, in III Ethic., quod hae virtutes sunt irrationabilium partium.

Respondeo dicendum quod irascibilis et concupiscibilis dupliciter considerari possunt. Uno modo secundum se, inquantum sunt partes appetitus sensitivi. Et hoc modo, non competit eis quod sint subiectum virtutis. Alio modo possunt considerari inquantum participant rationem, per hoc quod natae sunt rationi obedire. Et sic irascibilis vel concupiscibilis potest esse subiectum virtutis humanae, sic enim est principium humani actus, inquantum participat rationem. Et in his potentiis necesse est ponere virtutes.

Objection 3: Further, Augustine proves (De Moribus Eccl. v) that virtue is not in the body but in the soul, for the reason that the body is ruled by the soul: wherefore it is entirely due to his soul that a man make good use of his body: "For instance, if my coachman, through obedience to my orders, guides well the horses which he is driving; this is all due to me." But just as the soul rules the body, so also does the reason rule the sensitive appetite. Therefore that the irascible and concupiscible powers are rightly ruled, is entirely due to the rational powers. Now "virtue is that by which we live rightly," as we have said above ([Question \[55\]](#), [Article \[4\]](#)). Therefore virtue is not in the irascible and concupiscible powers, but only in the rational powers.

Objection 4: Further, "the principal act of moral virtue is choice" (Ethic. viii, 13). Now choice is not an act of the irascible and concupiscible powers, but of the rational power, as we have said above ([Question \[13\]](#), [Article \[2\]](#)). Therefore moral virtue is not in the irascible and concupiscible powers, but in the reason.

On the contrary, Fortitude is assigned to the irascible power, and temperance to the concupiscible power. Whence the Philosopher (Ethic. iii, 10) says that "these virtues belong to the irrational part of the soul."

I answer that, The irascible and concupiscible powers can be considered in two ways. First, in themselves, in so far as they are parts of the sensitive appetite: and in this way they are not competent to be the subject of virtue. Secondly, they can be considered as participating in the reason, from the fact that they have a natural aptitude to obey reason. And thus the irascible or concupiscible power can be the subject of human virtue: for, in so far as it participates in the reason, it is the principle of a human act. And to these powers we must needs assign virtues.

Quod enim in irascibili et concupiscibili sint aliquae virtutes, patet. Actus enim qui progreditur ab una potentia secundum quod est ab alia mota, non potest esse perfectus, nisi utraque potentia sit bene disposita ad actum, sicut actus artificis non potest esse congruus, nisi et artifex sit bene dispositus ad agendum, et etiam ipsum instrumentum. In his igitur circa quae operatur irascibilis et concupiscibilis secundum quod sunt a ratione motae, necesse est ut aliquis habitus perficiens ad bene agendum sit non solum in ratione, sed etiam in irascibili et concupiscibili. Et quia bona dispositio potentiae moventis motae, attenditur secundum conformitatem ad potentiam moventem; ideo virtus quae est in irascibili et concupiscibili, nihil aliud est quam quaedam habitualis conformitas istarum potentiarum ad rationem.

Ad primum ergo dicendum quod irascibilis et concupiscibilis secundum se consideratae, prout sunt partes appetitus sensitivi, communes sunt nobis et brutis. Sed secundum quod sunt rationales per participationem, ut obedientes rationi, sic sunt propriae hominis. Et hoc modo possunt esse subiectum virtutis humanae.

Ad secundum dicendum quod, sicut caro hominis ex se quidem non habet bonum virtutis, fit tamen instrumentum virtuosi actus, inquantum, movente ratione, membra nostra exhibemus ad serviendum iustitiae, ita etiam irascibilis et concupiscibilis ex se quidem non habent bonum virtutis sed magis infectionem fomitis; inquantum vero conformantur rationi, sic in eis adgeneratur bonum virtutis moralis.

Ad tertium dicendum quod alia ratione regitur corpus ab anima, et irascibilis et concupiscibilis a ratione. Corpus enim ad nutum obedit animae absque contradictione,

For it is clear that there are some virtues in the irascible and concupiscible powers. Because an act, which proceeds from one power according as it is moved by another power, cannot be perfect, unless both powers be well disposed to the act: for instance, the act of a craftsman cannot be successful unless both the craftsman and his instrument be well disposed to act. Therefore in the matter of the operations of the irascible and concupiscible powers, according as they are moved by reason, there must needs be some habit perfecting in respect of acting well, not only the reason, but also the irascible and concupiscible powers. And since the good disposition of the power which moves through being moved, depends on its conformity with the power that moves it: therefore the virtue which is in the irascible and concupiscible powers is nothing else but a certain habitual conformity of these powers to reason.

Reply to Objection 1: The irascible and concupiscible powers considered in themselves, as parts of the sensitive appetite, are common to us and dumb animals. But in so far as they are rational by participation, and are obedient to the reason, they are proper to man. And in this way they can be the subject of human virtue.

Reply to Objection 2: Just as human flesh has not of itself the good of virtue, but is made the instrument of a virtuous act, inasmuch as being moved by reason, we "yield our members to serve justice"; so also, the irascible and concupiscible powers, of themselves indeed, have not the good of virtue, but rather the infection of the "fomes": whereas, inasmuch as they are in conformity with reason, the good of reason is begotten in them.

Reply to Objection 3: The body is ruled by the soul, and the irascible and concupiscible powers by the reason, but in different ways. For the body obeys the soul blindly without any

in his in quibus natum est ab anima moveri, unde philosophus dicit, in I Polit., quod anima regit corpus despotico principatu, idest sicut dominus servum. Et ideo totus motus corporis refertur ad animam. Et propter hoc in corpore non est virtus, sed solum in anima. Sed irascibilis et concupiscibilis non ad nutum obediunt rationi, sed habent proprios motus suos, quibus interdum rationi repugnant, unde in eodem libro philosophus dicit quod ratio regit irascibilem et concupiscibilem principatu politico, quo scilicet reguntur liberi, qui habent in aliquibus propriam voluntatem. Et propter hoc etiam oportet in irascibili et concupiscibili esse aliquas virtutes, quibus bene disponantur ad actum.

Ad quantum dicendum quod in electione duo sunt, scilicet intentio finis, quae pertinet ad virtutem moralem; et praeacceptio eius quod est ad finem, quod pertinet ad prudentiam; ut dicitur in VI Ethic. Quod autem habeat rectam intentionem finis circa passiones animae, hoc contingit ex bona dispositione irascibilis et concupiscibilis. Et ideo virtutes morales circa passiones, sunt in irascibili et concupiscibili, sed prudentia est in ratione.

Whether the sensitive powers of apprehension are the subject of virtue?

Ad quantum sic proceditur. Videtur quod in viribus sensitivis apprehensivis interius, possit esse aliqua virtus. Appetitus enim sensitivus potest esse subiectum virtutis, inquantum obedit rationi. Sed vires sensitivae apprehensivae interius, rationi obediunt, ad imperium enim rationis operatur et imaginativa et cogitativa et memorativa. Ergo in his viribus potest esse virtus.

contradiction, in those things in which it has a natural aptitude to be moved by the soul: whence the Philosopher says (Polit. i, 3) that the "soul rules the body with a despotic command" as the master rules his slave: wherefore the entire movement of the body is referred to the soul. For this reason virtue is not in the body, but in the soul. But the irascible and concupiscible powers do not obey the reason blindly; on the contrary, they have their own proper movements, by which, at times, they go against reason, whence the Philosopher says (Polit. i, 3) that the "reason rules the irascible and concupiscible powers by a political command" such as that by which free men are ruled, who have in some respects a will of their own. And for this reason also must there be some virtues in the irascible and concupiscible powers, by which these powers are well disposed to act.

Reply to Objection 4: In choice there are two things, namely, the intention of the end, and this belongs to the moral virtue; and the preferential choice of that which is unto the end, and this belongs to prudence (Ethic. vi, 2,5). But that the irascible and concupiscible powers have a right intention of the end in regard to the passions of the soul, is due to the good disposition of these powers. And therefore those moral virtues which are concerned with the passions are in the irascible and concupiscible powers, but prudence is in the reason.

Objection 1: It would seem that it is possible for virtue to be in the interior sensitive powers of apprehension. For the sensitive appetite can be the subject of virtue, in so far as it obeys reason. But the interior sensitive powers of apprehension obey reason: for the powers of imagination, of cogitation, and of memory [*Cf. FP, Question [78], Article [4]] act at the command of reason. Therefore in these

Praeterea, sicut appetitus rationalis, qui est voluntas, in suo actu potest impediri, vel etiam adiuvari, per appetitum sensitivum; ita etiam intellectus vel ratio potest impediri, vel etiam iuvare, per vires praedictas. Sicut ergo in viribus sensitivis appetitivis potest esse virtus, ita etiam in apprehensivis.

Praeterea, prudentia est quaedam virtus, cuius partem ponit Tullius memoriam, in sua rhetorica. Ergo etiam in vi memorativa potest esse aliqua virtus. Et eadem ratione, in aliis interioribus apprehensivis viribus.

Sed contra est quod omnes virtutes vel sunt intellectuales, vel morales, ut dicitur in II Ethic. Morales autem virtutes omnes sunt in parte appetitiva, intellectuales autem in intellectu vel ratione, sicut patet in VI Ethic. Nulla ergo virtus est in viribus sensitivis apprehensivis interioribus.

Respondeo dicendum quod in viribus sensitivis apprehensivis interioribus, ponuntur aliqui habitus. Quod patet ex hoc praecipue quod philosophus dicit, in libro de memoria, quod in memorando unum post aliud, operatur consuetudo, quae est quasi quaedam natura, nihil autem est aliud habitus consuetudinalis quam habitudo acquisita per consuetudinem, quae est in modum naturae. Unde de virtute dicit Tullius, in sua rhetorica, quod est habitus in modum naturae, rationi consentaneus. In homine tamen id quod ex consuetudine acquiritur in memoria, et in aliis viribus sensitivis apprehensivis, non est habitus per se; sed aliquid annexum habitibus intellectivae partis, ut supra dictum est.

powers there can be virtue.

Objection 2: Further, as the rational appetite, which is the will, can be hindered or helped in its act, by the sensitive appetite, so also can the intellect or reason be hindered or helped by the powers mentioned above. As, therefore, there can be virtue in the interior powers of appetite, so also can there be virtue in the interior powers of apprehension.

Objection 3: Further, prudence is a virtue, of which Cicero (De Invent. Rhetor. ii) says that memory is a part. Therefore also in the power of memory there can be a virtue: and in like manner, in the other interior sensitive powers of apprehension.

On the contrary, All virtues are either intellectual or moral (Ethic. ii, 1). Now all the moral virtues are in the appetite; while the intellectual virtues are in the intellect or reason, as is clear from Ethic. vi, 1. Therefore there is no virtue in the interior sensitive powers of apprehension.

I answer that, In the interior sensitive powers of apprehension there are some habits. And this is made clear principally from what the Philosopher says (De Memoria ii), that "in remembering one thing after another, we become used to it; and use is a second nature." Now a habit of use is nothing else than a habit acquired by use, which is like unto nature. Wherefore Tully says of virtue in his Rhetoric that "it is a habit like a second nature in accord with reason." Yet, in man, that which he acquires by use, in his memory and other sensitive powers of apprehension, is not a habit properly so called, but something annexed to the habits of the intellective faculty, as we have said above ([Question \[50\]](#), [Article \[4\]](#), ad 3).

Sed tamen si qui sunt habitus in talibus viribus, virtutes dici non possunt. Virtus enim est habitus perfectus, quo non contingit nisi bonum operari, unde oportet quod virtus sit in illa potentia quae est consummativa boni operis. Cognitio autem veri non consummatur in viribus sensitivis apprehensivis; sed huiusmodi vires sunt quasi praeparatoriae ad cognitionem intellectivam. Et ideo in huiusmodi viribus non sunt virtutes, quibus cognoscitur verum; sed magis in intellectu vel ratione.

Ad primum ergo dicendum quod appetitus sensitivus se habet ad voluntatem, quae est appetitus rationis, sicut motus ab eo. Et ideo opus appetitivae virtutis consummatur in appetitu sensitivo. Et propter hoc, appetitus sensitivus est subiectum virtutis. Virtutes autem sensitivae apprehensivae magis se habent ut moventes respectu intellectus, eo quod phantasmata se habent ad animam intellectivam, sicut colores ad visum, ut dicitur in III de anima. Et ideo opus cognitionis in intellectu terminatur. Et propter hoc, virtutes cognoscitivae sunt in ipso intellectu vel ratione.

Et per hoc patet solutio ad secundum.

Ad tertium dicendum quod memoria non ponitur pars prudentiae, sicut species est pars generis, quasi ipsa memoria sit quaedam virtus per se, sed quia unum eorum quae requiruntur ad prudentiam, est bonitas memoriae; ut sic quodammodo se habeat per modum partis integralis.

Nevertheless even if there be habits in such powers, they cannot be virtues. For virtue is a perfect habit, by which it never happens that anything but good is done: and so virtue must needs be in that power which consummates the good act. But the knowledge of truth is not consummated in the sensitive powers of apprehension: for such powers prepare the way to the intellectual knowledge. And therefore in these powers there are none of the virtues, by which we know truth: these are rather in the intellect or reason.

Reply to Objection 1: The sensitive appetite is related to the will, which is the rational appetite, through being moved by it. And therefore the act of the appetitive power is consummated in the sensitive appetite: and for this reason the sensitive appetite is the subject of virtue. Whereas the sensitive powers of apprehension are related to the intellect rather through moving it; for the reason that the phantasms are related to the intellectual soul, as colors to sight (De Anima iii, text. 18). And therefore the act of knowledge is terminated in the intellect; and for this reason the cognoscitive virtues are in the intellect itself, or the reason.

And thus is made clear the Reply to the Second Objection.

Reply to Objection 3: Memory is not a part of prudence, as species is of a genus, as though memory were a virtue properly so called: but one of the conditions required for prudence is a good memory; so that, in a fashion, it is after the manner of an integral part.

Whether the will can be the subject of virtue?

Ad sextum sic proceditur. Videtur quod

Objection 1: It would seem that the will is not

voluntas non sit subiectum alicuius virtutis. Ad id enim quod convenit potentiae ex ipsa ratione potentiae, non requiritur aliquis habitus. Sed de ipsa ratione voluntatis, cum sit in ratione, secundum philosophum in III de anima, est quod tendat in id quod est bonum secundum rationem, ad quod ordinatur omnis virtus, quia unumquodque naturaliter appetit proprium bonum, virtus enim est habitus per modum naturae, consentaneus rationi, ut Tullius dicit in sua rhetorica. Ergo voluntas non est subiectum virtutis.

Praeterea, omnis virtus aut est intellectualis, aut moralis, ut dicitur in I et II Ethic. Sed virtus intellectualis est, sicut in subiecto, in intellectu et ratione, non autem in voluntate, virtus autem moralis est, sicut in subiecto, in irascibili et concupiscibili, quae sunt rationales per participationem. Ergo nulla virtus est in voluntate sicut in subiecto.

Praeterea, omnes actus humani, ad quos virtutes ordinantur, sunt voluntarii. Si igitur respectu aliquorum humanorum actuum sit aliqua virtus in voluntate, pari ratione respectu omnium actuum humanorum erit virtus in voluntate. Aut ergo in nulla alia potentia erit aliqua virtus, aut ad eundem actum ordinabuntur duae virtutes, quod videtur inconueniens. Voluntas ergo non potest esse subiectum virtutis.

Sed contra est quod maior perfectio requiritur in movente quam in moto. Sed voluntas movet irascibilem et concupiscibilem. Multo ergo magis debet esse virtus in voluntate, quam in irascibili et concupiscibili.

the subject of virtue. Because no habit is required for that which belongs to a power by reason of its very nature. But since the will is in the reason, it is of the very essence of the will, according to the Philosopher (De Anima iii, text. 42), to tend to that which is good, according to reason. And to this good every virtue is ordered, since everything naturally desires its own proper good; for virtue, as Tully says in his Rhetoric, is a "habit like a second nature in accord with reason." Therefore the will is not the subject of virtue.

Objection 2: Further, every virtue is either intellectual or moral (Ethic. i, 13; ii, 1). But intellectual virtue is subjected in the intellect and reason, and not in the will: while moral virtue is subjected in the irascible and concupiscible powers which are rational by participation. Therefore no virtue is subjected in the will.

Objection 3: Further, all human acts, to which virtues are ordained, are voluntary. If therefore there be a virtue in the will in respect of some human acts, in like manner there will be a virtue in the will in respect of all human acts. Either, therefore, there will be no virtue in any other power, or there will be two virtues ordained to the same act, which seems unreasonable. Therefore the will cannot be the subject of virtue.

On the contrary, Greater perfection is required in the mover than in the moved. But the will moves the irascible and concupiscible powers. Much more therefore should there be virtue in the will than in the irascible and concupiscible powers.

Respondeo dicendum quod, cum per habitum perficiatur potentia ad agendum, ibi indiget potentia habitu perficiente ad bene agendum, qui quidem habitus est virtus, ubi ad hoc non sufficit propria ratio potentiae.

Omnis autem potentiae propria ratio attenditur in ordine ad obiectum. Unde cum, sicut dictum est, obiectum voluntati sit bonum rationis voluntati proportionatum, quantum ad hoc non indiget voluntas virtute perficiente. Sed si quod bonum immineat homini volendum, quod excedat proportionem volentis; sive quantum ad totam speciem humanam, sicut bonum divinum, quod transcendit limites humanae naturae, sive quantum ad individuum, sicut bonum proximi; ibi voluntas indiget virtute. Et ideo huiusmodi virtutes quae ordinant affectum hominis in Deum vel in proximum, sunt in voluntate sicut in subiecto; ut caritas, iustitia et huiusmodi.

Ad primum ergo dicendum quod ratio illa habet locum de virtute quae ordinat ad bonum proprium ipsius volentis, sicut temperantia et fortitudo, quae sunt circa passiones humanas et alia huiusmodi, ut ex dictis patet.

Ad secundum dicendum quod rationale per participationem non solum est irascibilis et concupiscibilis; sed omnino, idest universaliter, appetitivum, ut dicitur in I Ethic. Sub appetitivo autem comprehenditur voluntas. Et ideo, si qua virtus est in voluntate, erit moralis, nisi sit theologica, ut infra patebit.

Ad tertium dicendum quod quaedam virtutes ordinantur ad bonum passionis moderatae, quod est proprium huius vel illius hominis, et

I answer that, Since the habit perfects the power in reference to act, then does the power need a habit perfecting it unto doing well, which habit is a virtue, when the power's own proper nature does not suffice for the purpose.

Now the proper nature of a power is seen in its relation to its object. Since, therefore, as we have said above ([Question \[19\]](#), [Article \[3\]](#)), the object of the will is the good of reason proportionate to the will, in respect of this the will does not need a virtue perfecting it. But if man's will is confronted with a good that exceeds its capacity, whether as regards the whole human species, such as Divine good, which transcends the limits of human nature, or as regards the individual, such as the good of one's neighbor, then does the will need virtue. And therefore such virtues as those which direct man's affections to God or to his neighbor are subjected in the will, as charity, justice, and such like.

Reply to Objection 1: This objection is true of those virtues which are ordained to the willer's own good; such as temperance and fortitude, which are concerned with the human passions, and the like, as is clear from what we have said ([Question \[35\]](#), [Article \[6\]](#)).

Reply to Objection 2: Not only the irascible and concupiscible powers are rational by participation but "the appetitive power altogether," i.e. in its entirety (Ethic. i, 13). Now the will is included in the appetitive power. And therefore whatever virtue is in the will must be a moral virtue, unless it be theological, as we shall see later on ([Question \[62\]](#), [Article \[3\]](#)).

Reply to Objection 3: Some virtues are directed to the good of moderated passion, which is the proper good of this or that man: and in

in talibus non est necessarium quod sit aliqua virtus in voluntate, cum ad hoc sufficiat natura potentiae, ut dictum est. Sed hoc solum necessarium est in illis virtutibus quae ordinantur ad aliquod bonum extrinsecum.

these cases there is no need for virtue in the will, for the nature of the power suffices for the purpose, as we have said. This need exists only in the case of virtues which are directed to some extrinsic good.