

or spatial world. It is only 'food' in so far as the subject conceives of it as a means of satisfying his desires, *i.e.* completing himself. What is willed is not 'food,' but the satisfaction of the subject by the eating of the food. The food exists only as thought by the subject, and it is made an 'end' only as the subject seeks to complete himself by means of it. The subject wills nothing but himself as so conceived. Thus his 'motive' is the conception of himself as realized in that form of thinking which we call 'will,' and therefore the 'motive' does not exist except in the volition. How, then, can the 'motive,' *i.e.* the volition, act upon the will? To say so is to say that the volition acts upon itself.

From what has been said it is obvious that there is no freedom without motives. The 'motive' being the mode in which the self-determining subject seeks to realize himself, freedom without motives would be freedom apart from a self-determining subject; in other words, it would be blind necessity. Only if there could be self-determination in general which was not a definite form of self-determination could there be will without a motive. To speak of will without motives is to substitute the bare possibility of will for actual will, and a possibility which is never realized is not even possible.