Neo-Aristotelian Supererogation

Rebecca Stangl
The University of Virginia

I. Urmson's Challenge

In his classic article, "Saints and Heroes," J.O. Urmson famously issues a challenge to moral philosophers. According to Urmson, a certain schema of types of actions is ubiquitous in moral theory. Theories that subscribe to the targeted schema recognize three, and only three, types of action from the point of view of moral worth: the obligatory, the merely permissible, and the forbidden. But the ubiquity of this schema, Urmson argues, is surpassed only by its inadequacy. In particular, the schema fails to account for supererogatory actions. There are certain saintly actions, Urmson claims, that are far beyond the limits of duty, and which contrary inclinations and self-interest would lead most people to omit. And there are certain heroic actions, Urmson claims, that are far beyond the bounds of duty, and which natural fear would lead most people to omit. These saintly and heroic actions are not obligatory, but neither are they merely morally permissible. They are morally admirable. They are thus counter-examples to the targeted schema.[1]

Defenders of comprehensive normative ethical theories have at least two options for responding to Urmson's challenge. They can embrace the three-fold classification, and explain away our intuitions about the particular cases Urmson presents. Or they can argue that their moral theory does not embrace the three-fold classification, and the theory's explanation of the moral worth of actions therefore captures the distinctive value thought to attach to these actions. Among consequentialists and Kantians, responses of both kinds exist.[2] But less has been said from the distinctly virtue-theoretical perspective in general, and the neo-Aristotelian perspective

in particular.[3] And what little discussion has emerged about supererogation and neo-Aristotelian virtue ethics tends to assume that only the former tack is available to neo-Aristotelians. In particular, a number of philosophers have argued that supererogation is incompatible with Aristotle's doctrine of the mean.[4]

I think this is a mistake. So in what follows, I take up Urmson's challenge and offer the following neo-Aristotelian account of supererogation:

> An action is supererogatory *iff* it is overall virtuous and either (a) the omission of an overall virtuous action in that situation would not be overall vicious or (b) there is some overall virtuous action that is less virtuous than it and whose performance in its place would not be overall vicious.

This account is non *ad hoc* insofar as it is based on virtue-ethical accounts of right and wrong action that are motivated from within the tradition. And I shall argue that it is intuitively defensible and fully compatible with the doctrine of the mean.

II. A Neo-Aristotelian Account of Supererogatory Action

There are few, if any, fully worked out neo-Aristotelian analyses of supererogatory action on offer in the philosophical literature. But the same cannot be said of neo-Aristotelian analyses of right action. And since supererogatory action is generally understood as a species of right action, a promising place to start in developing such an account is by modeling it on one of these accounts of right action.[5] In what follows, I take up this promising methodology. In particular, I shall develop an account of supererogatory action beginning from the "target-centered" account of right action developed and defended by Christine Swanton.[6]

The target-centered account of right action takes as its starting point Aristotle's distinction between an act done from virtue and a virtuous action. Someone can act from virtue, from a disposition of generosity, e.g., but her act might nonetheless fail to achieve the distinctive aims of generosity through no fault of her own. In such a case, it would be odd to describe the action as generous. Similarly, one might perform an action that achieves the distinctive aims of generosity, without all of the fine inner states that would accompany such an action were it performed by a truly generous person. In such a case, it is natural to say that a person performed a generous action but did not perform it as the generous person would.

From this it follows that the correct definition of "virtuous (in respect V) action" cannot be "whatever the virtuous (in respect V) person would do". The generous agent can perform an action that does not qualify as generous, and someone who is not generous can perform a generous action.[7] And similar considerations suggest that the correct definition of "right action" cannot be "whatever the fully virtuous person would do". A fully virtuous agent, through no fault of her own, might be ignorant of important facts and thus perform some action with disastrous consequences. And in certain circumstances, even though we would hesitate to blame such an agent, it would be odd to describe her action as right. Consider a doctor who, through no fault of her own, gives a patient a mislabeled and therefore lethal dose of medication. We do not blame the doctor for the lethal dosing, but it would be odd to describe it as right. Conversely, less than fully virtuous agents perform right actions, though perhaps not as the virtuous agent would.

So how should we define "virtuous (in respect V) action"? And how should we define "right action"? According to the target-centered account of right action, as follows:

(1) An action is virtuous in respect V (e.g. benevolent, generous) if and only if it hits the target of (realizes the end of) virtue V (e.g. benevolence, generosity).

(2) An action is right if and only if it is overall virtuous.

For the sake of clarity, I will briefly explicate the key steps in this definition. To hit the target of a virtue is defined, first, as "a form (or forms) of success in the moral acknowledgement of or responsiveness to items in its field or fields, appropriate to the aim of the virtue in a given context".[8] What exactly this means depends upon the virtue in question. The virtue of beneficence, for example, seems mainly concerned with the good of particular others; in terminology borrowed from Nussbaum, this is its field. Moreover, it is plausible to think that the appropriate form of moral responsiveness to others' goods is one of promotion. Given this, an action will be beneficent insofar as it successfully promotes the good of those in question. But the virtue of justice, for example, is importantly different. Justice is concerned with fair procedures or rights, and the appropriate form of responsiveness to such is respect rather than promotion. An action is just insofar as it succeeds in conforming to fair procedures or recognizing the rights of the parties involved; it is not just insofar as it maximizes or promotes instances of such conformity or recognition. So hitting the target of a virtue is not always a matter of promoting the values in question.

Indeed it need not consist in producing any external state of affairs at all. Some virtues such as determination seem rather to aim at a target that is internal to the agent: trying hard in a sustained way, in this case. One can succeed in hitting that target without succeeding in the particular endeavor to which one is applying her determination. Finally, hitting the target might involve more than one mode of moral response: the good friend both promotes the good of those with whom he is friendly and respects them by not manipulating them, for example. Much more

could be said about hitting the target of a virtue, but this sketch should serve our purpose.[9]

Overall virtuousness, in turn, is a function of the virtuousness of actions in these more particular respects. If only one virtue is relevant in a situation, then overall virtuousness will consist simply in hitting the target of that virtue. But in those cases in which more than one virtue is relevant, which action counts as overall virtuous is determined by the relative importance of the differing virtues at issue. As Swanton understands it, this process is a particularistic one: the way in which the virtuousness of an action in some respect contributes to its overall virtuousness is irreducibly dependent on context and which other virtues are relevant. There is thus no decision procedure for determining overall virtuousness, and hence no decision procedure for determining rightness either.

Finally, the account as given so far is compatible with a stronger, more demanding, interpretation and a weaker, less demanding, interpretation. According to the stronger interpretation:

> An act is right if and only if it is overall virtuous, and that entails that it is the, or a, best action possible in the circumstances. *Assuming that no other virtues or vices are involved*, we could say that a given act is right insofar as it is the most generous possible. The target of generosity on this view is very stringent: there is no large penumbra such that any act which falls within it is deemed right.[10]

And according to the weaker interpretation:

> An act is right if and only if it is overall virtuous, and that entails that it is good enough even if not the (or a) best action. Here it is assumed that there is much latitude in hitting the target of virtues such as generosity. Right acts range from the truly splendid and admirable to acts which are "all right".[11]

Swanton expresses a preference for the first interpretation, though she does not argue for it in detail. But I shall be endorsing the second, less demanding, interpretation. In some circumstances, more than one virtuous action seems available, some of which are more virtuous than others. Suppose that we both pass by a homeless person asking for help. You generously give him $20, and I give him $10. We both have similar resources, and neither of us will suffer any real hardship from giving the money. The natural thing to say is that we have both performed a generous action, but your action is somewhat more generous than mine.[12] But if an action qualifies as generous only if it is the (or a) best possible one, then this would be false. So it seems that an action can be generous without being perfectly generous.[13] If generosity were the only relevant virtue, such an action would be overall virtuous and therefore right.

But accepting this account of right action does not yet give us an account of supererogation. Right action is generally understood to be an ambiguous term, referring either to the obligatory or the permissible. It is clear that the target-centered account of right action does not refer to all and only those actions that Urmson classified as *merely* permissible. To say of an action that it is generous or benevolent takes us far beyond the notion of the merely permissible. Someone who performs a generous action, for example, acts well and not merely permissibly. But neither is it an account of obligatory action. Swanton herself thinks that, in many situations, there might well be two different actions each of which could be overall virtuous and so right on her account. But clearly any particular agent cannot perform all of the actions in question.[14] So the "overall virtuous" action cannot be identified with the obligatory either.

From this, we might be tempted to think that the account simply is an account of supererogatory action: after all, it is an account of morally good action that is neither an account of the merely permissible nor an account of obligation. But this would be a mistake. Even if the

category of overall virtuous action cannot be identified with the category of obligatory action, it might nonetheless include it. To borrow an example from Rosalind Hursthouse:

> [O]ne can say that it is 'absolutely required' that one does not 'pass by on the other side' when ones sees a wounded stranger lying by the roadside, but the requirement comes from charity and not justice[15].

In this case, we have an action – not passing by a wounded stranger – that is certainly the overall virtuous thing to do. But since the demands of charity are such that this action is absolutely required, its omission would be wrong. It is therefore not a supererogatory action, but an obligatory one. So the account is not an account of supererogation either.

What we have arrived at thus far is therefore an account of morally good action, including under that term both those actions that are 'absolutely required' and those that are not. But supererogatory actions just are those that are right or good to perform, but whose omission would not wrong. And required actions are those which are right to perform, and whose omission would be wrong. So what we need to distinguish the two, it seems, is a neo-Aristotelian account of wrong action.

Swanton does not develop such an account in detail, but does suggest that wrongness should be identified with overall viciousness.[16] This seems a promising place to start. But it requires working out. Just as there is a difference between acting out of virtue and performing a virtuous action, so there is a distinction between acting out of vice and performing a vicious action. Consider, for example, an unjust action. Someone can perform an unjust action without acting from vicious motivations. If a judge renders a decision that violates the norms of procedural fairness, it seems she has performed an unjust action. This is so even if her decision is issued in ignorance, or the result of misguided compassion. Conversely, an unjust person need

not always perform unjust actions when the opportunity arises. Indeed, if the unjust action could be easily detected and promises no great reward, the sensible knave will almost certainly not perform the unjust action. So "unjust action" cannot be equated with "whatever the unjust person would do".[17] For analogous reasons in the case of other vices, the correct definition of "vicious (in respect R) action" cannot be "whatever the vicious (in respect R) person would do". Nor should wrongness be defined as "what the vicious person (full stop) would do".

So what is it for an action to be vicious in some respect? And what is it for an action to be overall vicious (and so wrong)? I propose the following:

(3) An action is vicious in respect R (e.g. stingy, unjust) if and only if it constitutes a failure to hit the target of its corresponding virtue V (e.g. generosity, justice) in the manner distinctive of that vice (e.g. giving too little; failing to respect rights).

(4) An action is wrong if and only if it is overall vicious.

Let me briefly expand on (3): On the Aristotelian view, vices do not have targets of their own. To be stingy is not to have a settled disposition to achieve the aims of stinginess (from an undivided motivational state). It is to have a settled disposition not to achieve the aims of generosity by contributing too little (from an undivided motivational state). So where virtues have distinctive targets at which they aim, vices are distinctive ways of failing to hit the target of the corresponding virtue. And just as an action is virtuous insofar as it succeeds in hitting the target of the relevant virtue, I suggest that an action is vicious insofar as it constitutes a failure to hit the target of the relevant virtue in the manner distinctive of that vice.

The phrase "in the manner distinctive of that vice" accounts for the fact that virtues have more than one corresponding vice. The virtue of generosity, for example, has corresponding

vices of stinginess and profligacy. An action will count as stingy rather than profligate, for example, insofar as its failure is a deficit rather than an extreme.

Overall viciousness, in turn, is a function of the viciousness of actions in these more particular respects. If only one virtue is relevant in a situation, then overall viciousness will consist simply in a failure to hit the target of that virtue. But in those cases in which more than one virtue is relevant, which action counts as overall vicious will be determined by the relative importance of the differing virtues at issue. As in the case of overall virtuousness, this process is a particularistic one: the way in which the viciousness of an action in some respect contributes to its overall viciousness is irreducibly dependent on the context of the situation and which other virtues are relevant. There is thus no decision procedure for determining overall viciousness, and hence no decision procedure for determining wrongness either.

Finally, just as in the case of overall virtuousness, we can distinguish stronger and weaker interpretations of the claim that an action is overall vicious. Here are the parallel versions of the stronger and weaker interpretations of overall virtuousness as applied to overall viciousness, beginning with the stronger:

> An act is wrong if and only if it is overall vicious, and that entails that it is the, or a, worst action possible in the circumstances. *Assuming that no other virtues or vices are involved*, we could say that a given act is wrong insofar as it is the most stingy possible.

And according to the weaker interpretation:

> An act is wrong if and only if it is overall vicious, and that entails that it is bad enough even if not the (or a) worst action.

Here, it seems clear that the second interpretation is the correct one. An action can be pretty awful without being the worst possible. So I shall understand overall viciousness, and hence wrongness, on the weaker interpretation.

We are now in possession of a virtue-ethical account of rightness and wrongness. Since supererogatory actions just are those that are right or good to perform, but whose omission would not be wrong, it seems we are also in a position to offer a virtue-ethical account of supererogation. By combining the two accounts we arrive at the following:

> An action is supererogatory *iff* it is overall virtuous and its omission would not be overall vicious.

But this is too simple. Consider, for example, the following case from Hursthouse: Suppose my daughter's birthday is coming up and, considering all the facts about our relationship and my resources, generosity requires that I give her a present. Not to give her a present would be very mean. But now suppose, also, that I have two equally good options for which present to give her and no moral reason to favor one or other of the presents.[18] In such a case, one virtuous person might give her the first present and another equally virtuous agent might give her the second; either would be right according to Hursthouse's account. And either would be right according to the account of right actions I am defending, too: it seems that both hit the target of generosity.

Given this, the simple account fails.[19] For suppose I give my daughter the first present. It seems that I perform a generous action and so act well. But suppose also that, were I not to have given the first present – if it were, for example, sold out – then I would have given the second instead. In such a case I also perform a generous action and so act well. So the omission of the first present would not be overall vicious. So it looks like, on my account, giving the first present would be supererogatory. But of course the same argument, *mutatis mutandis*, can be

given for the conclusion that giving the second present would be supererogatory. So it seems that giving a present is not supererogatory, but giving any particular present is supererogatory. This cannot be right.

This is important because such situations are extremely common. I take it, for example, that generosity requires most of us to donate some reasonable amount of money to charitable causes. It would be stingy not to donate to charity at all. But which causes we donate to might well be open to personal choice. Around the holidays, for example, we are often invited to contribute to various charities. But we cannot give effectively to everyone who asks. Assuming that there a number of worthy causes we could give to, it thus follows that giving to any one of them would be overall virtuous, but failing to give to any one of them would not be overall vicious (supposing we simply chose another charity).

To take account of such common situations, we need to refine the account. So consider the following:

> An action is supererogatory *iff* it is overall virtuous and the omission of an overall virtuous action in that situation would not be overall vicious.

Given this refinement, the above problem does not arise. As Hursthouse presents the case, it would be overall vicious for me not to give one of the two presents, each of which is virtuous. So the omission of a virtuous action in that situation would be vicious. Thus giving the first present is virtuous, but not supererogatory. And of course the same argument, *mutatis mutandis*, shows that giving the second present is not supererogatory.

But there is a second kind of case that even the refined account gets wrong. Suppose we are dining out and virtue requires leaving a tip of at least 15%. To leave anything else would be stingy, and possibly even unjust. Suppose further that leaving anything more than 25% would

be overall vicious because, e.g., profligate or condescending to the server. This seems to leave open a range of possible supererogatory actions. We could, for example, tip 20% or even 25%. But the refined account suggests that there are no such supererogatory actions. Tipping 20% or 25% are both overall virtuous, but the omission of an overall virtuous action in that situation (namely, tipping at least 15%) would be overall vicious. So neither action comes out as supererogatory. But this seems wrong.

And this second kind of case is also important because it too is extremely common. Above, I said that generosity requires most of us to donate some reasonable amount of money to charity. Suppose, for a particular person, generosity requires donating 10% of her income to charity; any less than 10% would be stingy and thus overall vicious. And suppose that, given her others responsibilities, donating any more than 20% of her income to charity would be profligate and thus overall vicious. This seems to leave open a range of supererogatory giving: 15% or 20%, for example. But again, these actions would not come out as supererogatory on the refined account. Giving 20% is certainly overall virtuous, but the omission of an overall virtuous action in that situation (namely, giving at least 10%) would be overall vicious.

To take account of this complication, we need to make one final refinement. I therefore propose the following account of supererogation:

> An action is supererogatory *iff* it is overall virtuous and either (a) the omission of an overall virtuous action in that situation would not be overall vicious or (b) there is some overall virtuous action that is less virtuous than it and whose performance in its place would not be overall vicious.

This account solves the above problem. Tipping 20% or 25% both rightly come out as supererogatory on this account. Both are overall virtuous and there is some overall virtuous

action that is less virtuous than either of them, and whose performance in either of their places would not be overall vicious. Namely, tipping 15%. But tipping 15% is rightly excluded from the supererogatory. Tipping 15% is overall virtuous, but it would be overall vicious not to tip at all, and there is no less virtuous level at which to tip.

III. The Neo-Aristotelian Account and the Doctrine of the Mean: An Objection

I have proposed an account of supererogation according to which it is possible for an action to be virtuous even though its omission would not be vicious. But a number of philosophers have suggested that such an account is incompatible with Aristotle's doctrine of the mean.[20] According to Aristotle, every virtue is an intermediate condition. Both in our actions and our feelings, it avoids excess and deficiency. If our actions or feelings are excessive, we fall into the vice of excess. And if they are deficient we likewise fall into vice – the vice of deficiency. So in giving to others, for example, we can give too much and so be profligate. Or we can give too little, and so be stingy. But if we are to be generous, we will give neither too much nor too little. We will give an intermediate amount, to the right person, in the right way, and at the right time. This might seem to suggest that, in every morally relevant situation, we either do what is intermediate and thus virtuous, or we fall into the vice of excess or deficiency. But if that is correct, then there can be no actions that are virtuous to perform, but whose omission would not be vicious. And so, by my own account, there can be no supererogatory actions.[21]

Aristotle's doctrine of the mean is notoriously difficult to interpret. His talk of intermediate states has given rise to a quasi-quantitative interpretation of the doctrine of the mean, according to which virtue is a moderate amount and vice consists in "too much" or "too

little" in feeling or action.[22] But this interpretation has obvious problems: the intemperate person, for example, is not necessarily someone who desires too much or too many physical pleasures. It can also be someone whose desire for physical pleasure is directed toward the wrong object: someone else's wife, to give one of Aristotle's own examples.[23]

In response, some suggest that we ought not to understand the doctrine of the mean to imply that we have a moderate amount of feeling, or (what is stranger) perform moderate actions. The key point of the doctrine of the mean is rather that our feelings and actions must be appropriately related to the particular situations in which we find ourselves. [24] They thus emphasize Aristotle's comment that the virtuous person have these feelings and perform these actions, "at the right times, about the right things, toward the right people, for the right end, and in the right way."[25] After all, Aristotle himself takes this to be a gloss on the "intermediate condition" constitutive of virtue.

Of course, the latter interpretation has its own problems: in particular, it risks trivializing the doctrine of the mean. But the purpose of this paper is not to solve these interpretive problems. For my purposes, it will be enough to show that neither of the interpretations put forward are incompatible with my account.

Take the first, quasi-quantitative, interpretation. The quasi-quantitative interpretation implies that each virtue exists on a continuum, the extremes of which are both vices. But there are two things that the quasi-quantitative interpretation does not imply. First, it does not imply that anything that deviates from virtue is thereby vicious. It leaves it open that something might fall somewhere else on the continuum: not quite in the moderate middle, but not so far along the continuum to constitute a vice of excess or deficiency. Second, and as Howard Curzer has recently argued, even a quasi-quantitative doctrine of the mean need not say that, in every

situation, there is only one virtuous action that constitutes a mean.[26] Rather than picking out one particular virtuous action, we might say that the doctrine of the mean picks out a range of possible actions.[27] And within that range, some actions might be more virtuous than others. But this range would still fall on a scale the extremes of which are vicious. So the doctrine is clearly still a recognizable version of the doctrine of the mean.

Interpreting the mean in such a fashion allows for the possibility of supererogation. Curzer gives the following example that illustrates how this would work:

> Suppose daring Dirk and his sidekicks Dick, Derrick, and Dominik set out to rescue the damsel Daphne. Whenever they encounter danger, Dick charges forward and Derrick runs away. Dominick stands his ground and fights as long as they are facing lions and tigers and bears, but runs away whenever they encounter a dragon. Dirk never runs away and often takes a step forward so as to take the brunt of the attack upon himself.[28]

In such an example, Curzer claims, the right thing to say is that Dick is rash, Derrick is cowardly, Dominick is courageous and Dirk has heroic courage. All of this is compatible with the quasi-quantitative doctrine of the mean that Curzer accepts. Both Dominick's and Dirk's actions are "means" in relation to the extremes represented by Dick and Derrick. But Dirk's actions are more virtuous than Dominick's. Curzer thus concludes that, in general, "heroically virtuous people do not go to excess, but their actions remain at the high end of the intermediate range."[29] So the quasi-quantitative interpretation of the mean does seem compatible with supererogation.

But this still leaves the second interpretation of Aristotle's doctrine of the mean. Whatever else Aristotle might mean by the claim that virtues are means, he is certainly committed to the claim that the virtuous person "gets it right". But if the virtuous person "gets it right" doesn't this suggest that everyone else "gets it wrong"? So it looks like there are only two

options: do what the virtuous person would do, and act rightly. Or fail to do what the virtuous person would do, and act wrongly. Aristotle himself writes,

> [T]here are many ways to be in error – for badness is proper to the indeterminate, as the Pythagoreans pictured it, and good to the determinate. But there is only one way to be correct. That is why error is easy and correctness is difficult, since it is easy to miss the target and difficult to hit it. And so for this reason also excess and deficiency are proper to vice, the mean to virtue; 'for we are noble in only one way, but bad in all sorts of ways.'"[30]

This seems to suggest that, in every situation, there is only one possible action that qualifies as virtuous. Any other action, moreover, will count as vicious. If this is right, there can be no action whose commission is virtuous, but whose omission would not be vicious. And thus, we should conclude that there can be no supererogatory actions as I have defined them.

But this conclusion is too hasty. It follows only if Aristotle is committed to the claim that there is literally only one virtuous action possible in every situation. And while one might take the above passage to suggest this claim, Peter Losin has persuasively argued that this is not Aristotle's considered view.[31] Consider the metaphor that underlies the passage in question: Aristotle is here comparing right action (and emotions) with hitting a target. Hitting a target is indeed a fairly precise matter. And it is clearly possible to miss a target in innumerable ways, ways much more various than those which hit the target. But even so, any realistic target can be hit in more than one way. Thus Losin concludes,

> Aristotle's simile suggests virtue rarely demands a single precisely determined act, or an emotional reaction of particular intensity, duration, frequency, etc. It rather

> demands that one's acts or emotions fall somewhere within a more or less precisely delineated range.[32]

So I do not think that the passage in question should be taken as decisive evidence that Aristotle believes that there is one, and only one, way to behave that is ethically correct. There is more than one way to be virtuous. But if this is right, then failing to perform a particular virtuous action does not necessarily implicate one in performing a vicious action. And so the objection fails.

But one might modify the objection in an attempt to meet this point. Roger Crisp has recently argued for the incompatibility of supererogation with Aristotle's ethical theory in roughly the fashion I outline above: Crisp points out that one way Aristotle elucidates the concept of the "hitting the mean" is in terms of "fittingness". An action hits the mean when it fits the circumstances in which it is performed. And to perform such actions is, at Aristotle puts it, right or a duty. So in every situation we face, we can either do what is fitting and so act virtuously or do what is unfitting and so act viciously. Either way, there is no room for supererogation. So far, the argument looks structurally similar to the one given above. But Crisp adds the following comment:

> Aristotle might allow that in certain cases it is roughly equally fitting for you to help some other person or to do something for yourself. But then your duty will be to do one or other of these things: helping the other person will not be 'going beyond' duty.[33]

In making this concession, Crisp avoids imputing to Aristotle the implausible claim that there is literally only one way of acting virtuously in any situation. So two actions can be equally virtuous – recall Hursthouse's case of the two equally good presents. But he nonetheless denies that one action might be *more* virtuous than another.

But in response to this objection, I want to make two points. The first concerns Aristotle interpretation. Once one grants that Aristotle cannot mean that there is literally only one uniquely virtuous action in every situation, it is not obvious why one must impute to him the claim that all virtuous actions are equally virtuous. Return to the simile of hitting the target: Losin seems quite right that this simile (which Crisp also appeals to) does not imply that there is only one way of going right. Any actual target, in this world, can be hit in more than one way. But I would add to this the further point –which Losin does not note – that the simile also illustrates nicely how one virtuous action might be more excellent than another virtuous action. In most cases real world cases, one need not hit the bull's eye to hit the target; but hitting the bull's eye might be the most praiseworthy shot of all. Likewise, hitting just shy of the bull's-eye might be more praiseworthy than just making it onto the target. If hitting the mean is analogous to hitting a target, circumstances in which one can and does perform a supererogatory action might be analogous to hitting closer and closer to the bulls-eye.[34]

The second point is a normative one. It just seems implausible to think that all virtuous actions are equally virtuous. Return to the example I gave above, in which we pass a homeless person while walking together. You hand him $20; I give him $10. We both have similar resources, and neither of us will suffer any real hardship from giving the money. I suggested that the natural thing to say is that we have both performed a generous action, but your action is somewhat more generous than mine. But, on Crisp's view, this cannot be right. Instead, the case must be analyzed in one of three ways: (1) you have done something profligate and I have done something generous (2) you have done something generous and I have done something stingy or (3) we have both done something equally generous. I submit that none of these analyses is very plausible: For someone of middle-class resources, giving $20 to a homeless person can hardly be

thought profligate. But nor would it be very plausible to accuse someone who gives a homeless person the $10 in her pocket of stinginess. Finally, it would be strange indeed if I, who have given $10, insisted that my action was just as generous as your $20 gift.

This much, moreover, seems clear: none of the analyses compatible with Crisp's interpretation of the mean seems *as plausible* as my analysis of the case. The most that can be said in defense of any of them is that one (or more) is not totally implausible and could be accepted if one's interpretation of the doctrine of the mean required it. But I have given an interpretation of the doctrine of the mean that does not require it. And so charity speaks in favor of my interpretation as well.

IV. The Neo-Aristotelian Account and the Heroic and Saintly

So far I have constructed a neo-Aristotelian account of supererogation and argued that it is compatible with the doctrine of the mean. To succeed in answering Urmson's challenge, I have now to show that the account does what such an account should do: identify those actions that are supererogatory as supererogatory. I take up that task in the next two sections, beginning with the heroic and saintly and then turning to the mundane.

For most of us, heroic and saintly actions are the examples *par excellence* of supererogatory actions. As an example of a heroic action, let us take Urmson's now famous story: While a squad of soldiers is practicing throwing live hand grenades, a grenade slips and rolls onto the ground near the squad. One of the soldiers jumps on the grenade, thereby saving his comrades' lives by the sacrifice of his own. This soldier clearly does something morally good, not merely permissible. But it also seems intuitively plausible to say that he would not

have been wrong to omit the action, and hence he did more than was required. Any successful account of supererogation needs to explain both of these claims.

My account straightforwardly explains why the action is morally good. What makes the action morally good is that, for some particular soldier, it might be an instance of great courage and generosity, courage and generosity are the relevant virtues at stake, and hence the action is overall virtuous. I want to emphasize the importance, on the neo-Aristotelian view, of the qualification "for some particular soldier". Whether an action is courageous and generous depends upon very particular facts about the agent's situation. This is not to say that Aristotle is a subjectivist about virtues or the virtuousness of actions. There is a perfectly *objective* answer to the question of whether it would be generous or courageous for *any particular* soldier to jump on the grenade. But there is no perfectly *abstract* answer to the question of whether it would be generous or courageous for *just any* soldier to jump on the grenade.

It is part of the canonical understanding of the virtue-theoretical approach to morality that the "right" or "mean" in action and feeling is relative to the particular circumstances of an individual, and can only be determined by the person of practical wisdom. Everyone ought to be generous, but what constitutes an appropriate level of giving for a very wealthy person, for example, may constitute an inappropriate level of giving for a person of modest means. And everyone ought to be courageous, but what constitutes bravery for someone with specialized military training, for example, may constitute foolishness on the part of an untrained civilian. It is only once we know exactly the circumstances of the agent who is proposing to undertake a particular action in a particular context that we can know whether it is virtuous in some respect. And acquiring this kind of knowledge requires a great deal of practical wisdom.[35]

So the claim is not that it is courageous or generous for a soldier in just any situation to jump on the grenade. Indeed, there might be situations in which jumping on the grenade would be overall vicious and hence wrong. Perhaps those who have small children who depend upon them, for example, ought not to undertake such action if someone else is willing and able. Doing so might be vain and foolish rather than courageous and generous. The claim is rather that, insofar as we think that jumping on the grenade was the best action for someone to undertake in the situation, it is because it is overall virtuous for them, given all the relevant facts about the situation.

Consider the real life case of Maximilian Kolbe. Kolbe's story involves not a grenade, but rather a concentration camp. Having been arrested by the Gestapo for his involvement in hiding Jews, Kolbe was imprisoned in Auschwitz. While there, three men escaped. In retaliation, and to deter further escape attempts, the deputy commander selected ten men at random to be starved to death in an underground bunker. When one of the men cried out for his wife and children, Kolbe volunteered to take his place. Kolbe had no dependents for whom he was responsible, and the man he replaced did. His action was both courageous and generous – not only toward the man, but also toward the man's family.

But the account also explains why he would not have been wrong to omit the action, and hence he did more than was required. An action is wrong, on my account, if it is overall vicious. But it would be very counter-intuitive to describe an omission to volunteer for death in the place of another as overall vicious. Consider that many others failed to volunteer: is it at all plausible to describe their failure as overall vicious (because, e.g., cowardly and stingy)? It seems not. Likewise in the grenade case: we do not think the beneficiaries of the soldier's action acted viciously in not jumping on the grenade. This is so even if they did not have dependents for

whom they were responsible, or any other circumstance that would have made it vicious for them *to* jump on the grenade.

I believe that a similar analysis can be given of those actions that are considered saintly.[36] Consider the lives of two equally talented doctors. Both doctors live full but relatively conventional lives, with thriving practices. In their practices, they help many people, charge fair prices, and contribute a share of their time and services to *pro-bono* treatment of those who could not otherwise afford decent care. Now suppose an opportunity to join Doctors without Borders presents itself to both doctors. The first doctor declines; the second doctor accepts. In accepting, the second doctor gives up her comfortable practice to live a life of service. She lives a very full and rewarding life, though it is difficult in many respects and not particularly financially rewarding. But she spends all her time helping those who, without her sacrifice, would be without care of any kind.

What I want to say about these cases is that both doctors (qua doctors) live lives that are overall virtuous, but the second does something supererogatory in choosing a life of greater service. The first doctor's life (qua doctor) is overall virtuous insofar as it is virtuous to charge a fair price, treat his patients well, and contribute something to those who are less fortunate. But none of these actions are supererogatory, because failing to charge a fair price, treat his patients well, or contribute something to those less fortunate would be vicious.

But in giving up her comfortable practice to dedicate herself to serving the less fortunate, the second doctor does something supererogatory. Doing so is surely overall virtuous. But suppose she passed on this opportunity and simply gone on to live a life similar to the first doctor. We have already granted that the first doctor's life (qua doctor) is overall virtuous, so it is hard to see how choosing that life would have been vicious. Thus, volunteering is virtuous

even though not volunteering would not have been vicious. So the account also explains the supererogatory status of saintly actions.

One might object at this point. Urmson defines saintly actions as those that are beyond duty, and in which contrary inclinations and self-interest would lead most people not to do them. And this seems also to apply to heroic actions: it is not in the self-interest of the soldier to jump on the grenade. But most versions of virtue ethics take it that virtue is in the interest of the agent; it is thought of variously as a necessary condition, partially constitutive of, or even sufficient for happiness. So it might seem that saintly and heroic actions are impossible on the account I give: if an action is overall virtuous, it cannot be at the same time contrary to the person's self-interest.

But this objection is mistaken. The claim that virtue is in the interest of the agent does not imply that each and every virtuous action is in the interest of the agent. According to neo-Aristotelianism, the virtues are in the interest of the agent in the sense that virtues are character traits that a human being needs to flourish. But it is also in the interest of the agent to have sufficient external goods, such as wealth, friends, and health. These are also necessary in order to flourish. And in some cases, an action might be genuinely virtuous but nonetheless involve a sacrifice of some external good that could contribute to a flourishing life.[37] Aristotle's own example of this concerns bravery and war: it is in the interest of a person to be brave, but the brave person will be ready to sacrifice his life in battle when doing so will achieve a proportionally good aim.[38] Presumably he could say something similar about the heroic actions of Urmson's soldier.

The case of saintly actions is more challenging. For the paradigmatic saintly agent, it is not just one action that seems not to be in her interest. Rather, she seems to adopt an extreme

life-style that is not in her interest. So it might seem that it is her virtue that works against her self-interest, and not just a virtuous action or actions. But I think this is mistaken, for two reasons: First, what is working against the self-interest of the doctor is not her virtue but the conditions of the world in which she finds herself. Were there less global inequality, for example, the need for such sacrifices would be all but eliminated. In this sense, the difference between the soldier and the doctor is not one of kind but degree. They both face extreme need, and make a sacrifice that is proportional to the good they achieve. In the former case, the need is acute and in the latter it is chronic. But the sacrifice owes to the virtuous actions undertaken in the face of the circumstances and not the possession of the virtue itself. Second, there might well be a limit to how much one should sacrifice in the face of chronic need. If volunteering overseas were to undermine one's own health, perhaps it would not be virtuous to do so. But from this it does not follow that making some sacrifice in meeting this need is not virtuous.

So the claim that virtue, in general, is in the interest of the agent is not incompatible with a particular virtuous action representing a sacrifice on the part of that same agent. If a virtue ethicist were to claim that virtue alone were sufficient for happiness, things might be otherwise. But this is just one more reason to reject such a Stoic conception of the relation between virtue and happiness. In any case, it is certainly not a characteristically Aristotelian claim.

V. The Neo-Aristotelian Account and the Mundane

I have argued that my account of supererogation explains why saintly and heroic actions are supererogatory. But Urmson argues that heroic and saintly actions are only the most conspicuous cases of supererogation, and that they differ only in degree and not kind from more ordinary actions that should also be considered supererogatory. Urmson does not give a name to

this class of supererogatory actions, but I shall henceforth refer to them as "mundane" supererogatory actions.

But how exactly are these actions to be characterized? Urmson is quite a bit less precise in discussing mundane acts of supererogation. Here is his clearest statement concerning their nature:

> It is possible to go just beyond one's duty by being a little more generous, forbearing, helpful, or forgiving than *fair dealing demands*, or to go a very long way beyond the basic code of duties with the saint or hero.[39]

This passage is puzzling. On the most obvious reading, no acts of generosity and forgiveness are actually *demanded* by "fair dealing". Fair dealing seems rather to have to do with demands of justice, and someone who fails in generosity does not thereby also fail in justice. But if this is correct, then every act of generosity, for example, will go beyond our duty and therefore count as supererogatory.

This seems not to be the result Urmson intends. To say that we can go just beyond our duty by being "a little more generous" than demanded suggests that there is some level of generosity which duty does demand. But whatever Urmson's intention, many who defend the existence of supererogatory actions do seem to embrace the more extreme claim that all acts of generosity, for example, are supererogatory. In the course of arguing that supererogatory actions show the independence of aretaic and deontic judgments, for example, Gregory Trianosky cites helping with a telethon, or donating to charity as paradigmatic examples of supererogation.[40] More systematically, David Heyd claims that acts of generosity, charity, and giving are types of supererogatory acts. They are all instances of beneficent acts, and as such go beyond the call of duty. Similarly, forgiveness, mercy, and pardon are typically supererogatory, according to

Heyd.[41] The implication seems to be that mundane acts of supererogation are very common indeed, and occur anytime we perform actions that go beyond the demands of justice.

On the view I am defending, this is a mistake. If an action is overall virtuous insofar as it is generous and refraining from it would be overall vicious insofar as it would be stingy, then the action is required. It is not supererogatory. But this seems exactly right to me. Suppose I agree to give you a ride home from a party, but only if we leave by 11pm. When the agreed upon time comes, you are in the middle of a conversation. You ask me to wait five minutes. It seems quite right to wait. But notice that I would not fail in any duty of justice to you if I do not wait: we had an agreement to leave at a particular time, and I am perfectly willing to keep to our agreement. I am perfectly willing to do what "fair dealing" requires. So it seems that Heyd and Urmson will have to say that I would perform a supererogatory action were I to wait.

But this seems wrong. Supposing I have no other pressing obligations, and supposing you are not habitually demanding or inconsiderate, it does not seem a stretch to say that I *ought* to wait the five minutes and would act wrongly if I did not. On my analysis, this is because the virtue of kindness or generosity might well require me to perform it, in the sense that it would be generous to wait and stingy to refuse. (I can be generous with my time as well as my money.) So a failure to wait is blameworthy. And hence waiting is not supererogatory.

It is true that we are much less likely to judge someone to have acted wrongly if he fails only in generosity rather than justice. But from this it does not follow that he has not acted wrongly. It can be wrong to blame someone who has in fact acted wrongly if we lack the requisite epistemic grounding to actually know that he has acted wrongly. The demands of most of the virtues, as I have said, are relative to the individual as well as the situation. It follows from this that we are rarely in any position to make such a judgment of an individual. Justice, on

the other hand, concerns publically accessible standards that apply to each and every rational agent just as such. And so our epistemic standing for blaming the unjust is almost always much greater than it would be for blaming the ungenerous. But this does not preclude someone being blameworthy just insofar as he is ungenerous.

So the fact that not every mundane act of generosity, say, comes out as supererogatory on my account seems to me an advantage and not a disadvantage of the account. But from this we should not conclude that no mundane acts of giving are supererogatory. David Heyd has argued that any Kantian attempt to reduce supererogatory actions to imperfect duties faces the following objection: Imperfect duties are duties that I could fulfill in more than one way. So suppose I have an imperfect duty that could be fulfilled either be doing x or by doing y. If I do both x and y, I seem to have done more than duty required. And so imperfect duties themselves imply the possibility of supererogation. The category of the supererogatory can thus not be reduced to them.[42]

A similar point could be pressed against my account: Suppose the virtue of generosity requires all of us to donate some money to charitable causes, and I could fulfill this duty by donating to x or y. If instead of donating only to x or y I donate to both x and y, then I seem to have done more than generosity required. And thus the mundane act of donating to x, say, is supererogatory.

This seems to me correct. But notice that mundane acts of supererogation, even granting this, will only be supererogatory when viewed in light of a broader narrative of the agent's life. Donating to some particular charity is supererogatory only if we have already given enough to fulfill the demands of generosity and refraining would therefore reflect no meanness on our part. (I am assuming that it is within our means to give even more than generosity requires, and that

by doing so, we are not violating the demands on any other virtue.) So the supererogatory status of the action is in some sense derivative.

And this seems exactly right. Above, we granted that the doctor who spends her life in service for Doctors without Borders, as well as the soldier who jumped on the grenade, are paradigmatic cases of the supererogatory. But if they are both paradigmatic cases of supererogation, they are importantly different paradigms. In the soldier's case, the action appears supererogatory even when understood largely outside of context. But the case of the doctor is not like that. Giving up her practice in order to devote herself to charitable work is admirable just insofar as it involves a commitment to many smaller actions of generosity and compassion. The actions are not different in kind from what would be expected of any ordinarily generous and compassionate person; I stipulated that the first doctor also did some *pro bono* work. What distinguishes the second doctor is the degree to which her life is dedicated to performing such actions. This is why, while it is natural to say of the soldier that he performed a heroic deed, it is in some ways more natural to say of the doctor that she chose a saintly life.

VI. Conclusion

There are some actions that are morally required of each and every one of us, and which no decent person may omit. According the neo-Aristotelian version of virtue ethics I defend, what makes these actions good and right is that they are overall virtuous. And the reason no one may decently omit them is that to do so would be overall vicious. But there are also actions which are outstandingly virtuous, and so good and right in profound ways, even though it would not be overall vicious to omit them, or to perform some less virtuous action in their place. Such actions, I have argued, are rightly categorized as supererogatory.

[1] J.O. Urmson, "Saints and Heroes," in *Essays in Moral Philosophy*, ed. A.I. Melde (Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press, 1958): 198-216. For other classic treatments of supererogation and the challenge it presents for moral theory, see Roderick Chisholm, "Supererogation and Offence: A Conceptual Scheme for Ethics," *Ratio* 5 (1963): 1-14; David Heyd, *Supererogation* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1982), and "Supererogation," *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2012 Edition): URL: <http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2012/entries/supererogation/>; Gregory Mellema, *Beyond the Call of Duty: Supererogation, Obligation, and Offence* (Albany, NY: SUNY Press, 1991).

[2] Among Kantians, see Marcia Baron, "Kantian Ethics and Supererogation," *The Journal of Philosophy* 84 (1987): 237-262 for the former tack and Thomas E. Hill, "Kant on Imperfect Duty and Supererogation," *Kant-Studien* 62:1 (1971): 55-76, for the latter. Among consequentialists, see Fred Feldman, *Doing the Best We Can* (Dordrecht: Reidel, 1986) for the former and Jean-Paul Vessel, "Supererogation for Utilitarianism," *American Philosophical Quarterly* 47 (2010): 299–317, for the latter.

[3] An exception to the former is the sentimentalist account proposed by Michael Slote in his, "Famine, Affluence, and Virtue," in *Working Virtue: Virtue Ethics and Contemporary Moral Problems,* eds. Rebecca L. Walker and Philip J. Ivanhoe (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2007), 279-296. Jason Kawall's virtuous ideal observer account, in ""Virtue Theory, Ideal Observers, and the Supererogatory," *Philosophical Studies* 146:2 (2009): 179-96 is another possible exception, though his account might best be characterized as a hybrid of virtue ethics and ideal observer theory rather than a pure virtue-ethical theory.

[4] See, most recently, Roger Crisp, "Supererogation and Virtue," in *Oxford Studies in Normative Ethics*, ed. Mark Timmons (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2013), 13-34; and also Heyd, *Supererogation*, ch. 2; Slote, "Famine, Affluence, and Virtue,"; and Jason Kawall, "Virtue Theory, Ideal Observers, and the Supererogatory".

[5] Jason Kawall's "Virtue Theory, Ideal Observers, and the Supererogatory," follows a similar procedure in considering the prospects for a virtue-ethical account of supererogation, and rejects the resulting theories as inadequate. But the account of supererogation that he develops on behalf of the target-centered account of right action is completely different than the one I develop here. So while his arguments against that account may succeed, they do not apply to the account developed here.

[6] Christine Swanton, *On Virtue Ethics* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2003), 228. Swanton herself refers to this as a virtue-ethical account of right action, whereas I am referring to it as a neo-Aristotelian account of right action. I believe Swanton opts for the former because she is not a neo-Aristotelian as concerns her overall ethical outlook. But this is because she rejects what she takes to be Aristotle's account of what make a virtue a virtue: *eudaimonism.* Her account of right action, however, is independent of that issue, and self-consciously inspired by Aristotle. So I take it that neo-Aristotelians can perfectly well help themselves to a target-centered theory of right action.

[7] It is the former that is incompatible with defining virtuous action as "whatever the virtuous agent would do" if that phrase is understood to refer only to the action and not the inner states or motivations of the one performing it.

[8] Swanton, *Virtue Ethics*, 233.

[9] For more, see Swanton, *Virtue Ethics*, chapter 11.

[10] Swanton, *Virtue Ethics*, 239-40. (Emphasis in the original.)

[11] Swanton, *Virtue Ethics*, 240.

[12] Cf. Howard Curzer, *Aristotle and the Virtues* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2012), 142. I return to this point below, giving further examples, and argue that it is (appearances notwithstanding) compatible with the doctrine of the mean.

[13] Dan Russell has argued very persuasively for a similar claim about the possession of virtue. Someone can be generous full stop, he argues, without being perfectly generous. See Daniel C. Russell, *Practical Intelligence and the Virtues* (Oxford, UK: Oxford UP, 2009).

[14] Swanton, *On Virtue Ethics*, 295. Of course, this is even more obviously the case on the weaker interpretation of the account I endorse.

[15] Roaslind Hursthouse, *On Virtue Ethics* (New York, NY: Oxford University Press, 1999), 6.

[16] Swanton, *Virtue Ethics*, 240.

[17] On this point, see Bernard Williams, "Justice as a virtue," in *Essays on Aristotle's Ethics*, ed. A.O. Rorty (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1981), 189-200.

[18] Hursthouse, *On Virtue Ethics*, 66-70.

[19] A similar issue arises for Kantian accounts of supererogation and their relation to imperfect duties.

[20] See footnote 4 above.

[21] This leaves it open that, strictly speaking, the analysis of supererogatory actions is correct, i.e. that it gives the right counter-factual conditions for what it would be for an action to be supererogatory. It just implies that no such actions exist, because every failure in virtue implies the existence of vice. But since part of my argument for that analysis will be that it correctly identifies which actions are supererogatory, this would undermine my argument for the analysis (even if it does not contradict the analysis itself, strictly speaking).

[22] E.g., J.O. Urmson, "Aristotle's Doctrine of the Mean," *American Philosophical Quarterly* 10:3 (1973): 223-230. And, while not endorsing it, Julia Annas argues that most of Aristotle's ancient interlocutors did understand the doctrine of the mean to imply that one ought to have a "moderate" amount of feeling, at least. See Julia Annas, *The Morality of Happiness* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1993), 59ff.

[23] I owe this point to Rosalind Hursthouse, "A False Doctrine of the Mean," *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 81 (1980 - 1981): 57-72.

[24] See, e.g., Hursthouse, "A False Doctrine of the Mean"; and Nancy Sherman, *Making a Necessity of Virtue: Aristotle and Kant on Virtue* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1997), esp. 328-330.

[25] Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, tans. Terence Irwin (Indianapolis, IN: Hackett Publishing Company, 1985), 1106b 20ff.

[26] Howard Curzer, *Aristotle and the Virtues* (Oxford: Oxford UP, 2012), 142.

[27] Of course, this isn't to deny that, in some situations, there might be only one virtuous action available.

[28] Curzer, *Aristotle and the Virtues*, 142.

[29] Curzer, *Aristotle and the Virtues*, 142.

[30] Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1106b 29ff.

[31] See Peter Losin, "Aristotle's Doctrine of the Mean," *History of Philosophy Quarterly* 4:3 (1987): 329-42. Cited in Curzer, *Aristotle and the Virtues*, 141.

[32] Losin, "Aristotle's Doctrine of the Mean," 331.

[33] Crisp, "Supererogation and Virtue," 23.

[34] This is not to suggest that "hitting the bull's-eye" is always supererogatory. As I have said above, there are circumstances in which there is only one possible virtuous action, whose omission would be vicious. There are also circumstances in which all virtuous actions are equally virtuous, e.g. Hursthouse's case of the two equally good presents, and the omission of all of them would be vicious. In such cases, hitting the target and hitting bull's-eye collapse into one, and neither is supererogatory.

[35] Cf. Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics,* 1106a 25- 1106b 35. This is the point Aristotle is making when he discusses Milo the wrestler and his eating habits. From a strictly numerical perspective, six pounds of food might be a moderate amount. But whether it is the "right" or "mean" amount of food for any particular person depends upon who is eating the food. For most of us, it is probably too much food; for Milo it might be too little. So there is a fact of the matter about how much food one ought to eat, an amount of food that is neither too little nor too much, but that amount is different for different people. The case of virtue is similar, though of course more complex.

[36] Urmson's own example of a saintly action repeats a story about Francis of Assisi given to us by Bonaventura. When Francis had finished preaching to the birds, Bonaventura tells us, rather than accept the praise of his companions, he reproached himself for having, "hitherto failed in what he now considered his duty to preach to the feathered world." But, Urmson tells us, Francis was certainly mistaken that he failed in his duty. So even if Francis's actions were morally praiseworthy, they were not his duty. But this example is odd. Why should preaching to birds be morally good? (Worries of this kind may explain why virtually all discussions of the supererogatory have focused on the soldier example, and not on St. Francis.) So I have replaced it above with a better candidate.

[37] Cf. Hursthouse, *On Virtue Ethics*, chapter 8, esp. 170-174.

[38] Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1115aff

[39] Urmson, "Saints and Heroes," 205. [Italics mine.]

[40] Gregory Trianosky, "Supererogation, Wrongdoing, and Vice: On the Autonomy of the Ethics of Virtue," *The Journal of Philosophy* 83: 1 (1986): 6-40.

[41] Heyd, *Supererogation*, 1-4.

[42] Heyd, *Supererogation*, 56-61.