Justifying
Emotions

Pride and Jealousy

Kristján Kristjánsson

Also available as a printed book
see title verso for ISBN details

JUSTIFYING EMOTIONS

Justifying Emotions is a topical and controversial discussion of the ethical and moral problems surrounding emotions. Kristján Kristjánsson challenges the usual view of emotion as a negative influence on the formation of proper moral judgement, using pride and jealousy as examples of two emotions that are essential to harmonious human existence. He argues that experience of the traditionally 'negative' emotions of pride and jealousy is not evidence of moral failing, but rather that these supposed vices contribute to a well-rounded, virtuous life.

The book begins with a critical introduction to cognitive theories of the emotions, before going on to consider the place of the emotions in moral theories such as utilitarianism and virtue ethics. A discussion of the nature of moral and emotional excellence is followed by detailed defences of both pride and jealousy. A final chapter is dedicated to issues surrounding the teaching of virtue and the education of the emotions.

Kristjánsson's first aim in this book is to explore the moral justification of emotion, and the link between this justification and the notions of moral and emotional excellence. His second aim is to give a more sympathetic hearing to the emotions of pride and jealousy, arguing that a certain kind of pride is actually necessary for personhood and that jealousy is necessary to maintain pride and self-respect. Kristjánsson concludes that not experiencing the emotions of pride and jealousy, when called for, would be evidence of a moral failing.

Justifying Emotions: Pride and Jealousy makes a thought-provoking and practical contribution to the current debate on the emotions and is sure to spark greater concern about the 'negative' emotions in general. It will be of interest to the general reader, in addition to students and professionals working in the areas of philosophy, psychology and education.

Kristján Kristjánsson is Professor of Philosophy at the University of Akureyri, Iceland. He is the author of *Social Freedom: The Responsibility View* (1996).

ROUTLEDGE STUDIES IN ETHICS AND MORAL THEORY

JUSTIFYING EMOTIONS

Pride and Jealousy

Kristján Kristjánsson

FOR MY SON, HLÉR, WHO HAS TRIED HIS
BEST TO TEACH ME PATIENCE AS A
MORAL AND EMOTIONAL VIRTUE, AND
MY WIFE, CHIA-JUNG

CONTENTS

CONTENTS

PREFACE

Whenever people ask me 'When did you first become interested in emotions?', I give the pat answer 'Pretty soon after I was born'. This terse reply does not rest so much on platitudes about man being by birth a pondering animal, sparing no pains to dig out philosophical and scientific truths, as on a much simpler observation: Everybody is interested in the emotions for they constitute a core ingredient, if not the essence, of human life. However, the question should perhaps be understood in a narrower sense to mean 'When did you first become *academically* interested in emotions?' In that sense, a truthful response requires a piece of philosophical autobiography.

The development of my academic interest in the emotions coincided with a growing disillusionment with certain trends in contemporary political philosophy, the field to which I had devoted much of my academic attention since the completion of my doctorate. Consider a group of well-educated people of different nationalities or ethnicity sitting together in a street café, convincing each other – with mutually understandable arguments – of the essential impossibility of mutual understanding, and you have a striking, if a little over-simplified, image of much of what has been going on in political philosophy of late. Let it suffice here to say that such philosophy does not offer proper sustenance for one, such as the present author, who is an Aristotelian naturalist at heart, a universalist, and an inveterate believer in the 'Enlightenment Project'. Nor does its lack of serious engagement with foundational conceptual issues give satisfaction to one who considers the analytical way of doing philosophy the remnant of a certain passionate seriousness which has gradually been disappearing from many other 'traditions of inquiry' or – to use more fashionable jargon – 'discursive fields'.

Allow me to be even more personal here. I imagine that we are all familiar with the perennial question 'What book would you take with you if you had to stay for a year on a desert island?' Arguably, I answered that question for myself a few years ago, through action rather than words, when I chose a book to accompany me on a long journey. The destination was admittedly not a desert island, yet it was a place where experience had taught me that

my verbal communication with the locals would be scant. I was going to Taiwan to attend my father-in-law's funeral; the book, *Andvökur* [*Wakeful Nights*], was a selection from the works of the celebrated Icelandic poet Stephan G. Stephansson (1853–1927) who spent most of his life in rural Canada but wrote his verse in Icelandic. During the preparatory days of chanting, while tonsured monks and nuns read from right to left about Buddha's omniscience, I read Stephansson's poetry from left to right. Perhaps it was the climate's fault; his verse warmed the cockles of my heart as never before. What is more, an important truth was borne in on me, one closely connected to the ambience of the place. Despite the smog of urban Taiwan where, as the farmer Stephansson would have put it, no 'unclouded eastern sun / blazes up glen and grade', and 'the space of life' is 'narrowed in every respect', I felt as if the poet's spirit imbued every person in sight, be it the chanting monk, the *nouveau riche* businessman, or the street vendor. His insights and emotions were with us and in us, in them as well as in me. I have never sensed the presence of an inter-human denominator as strongly as during those days in Taiwan. I realised that if it was myopic to think that the justification of social arrangements could only appeal to a limited group of 'us', for instance 'us in Western liberal democracies' as now seems to be the received wisdom in political philosophy, then such relativism would be even more ill-considered in the case of human emotions which surely are the same all over the world. I decided that if I should ever put pen to paper to discuss emotions, my task would be essentially the same as that of Stephansson – himself an avowed son of the Enlightenment – to try to convey the universality of the nature and justification of our emotions; to try to capture, or if necessary *re*capture, their 'root flavour'. My fundamental acknowledgement, at the beginning of this book, must go to Stephan G. Stephansson.

As a matter of fact, I had first thought of writing about jealousy and pride during my postgraduate days in St Andrews. I am grateful to my erstwhile supervisor Gordon Graham for sounding all the correct warning signals at that time and persuading me to postpone the project. I picked up the thread again during my sabbatical year at the University of East Anglia in 1996–7. I am indebted to Alec Fisher who at that time chaired the philosophy section, and most particularly to Martin Hollis who showed an acute interest in my exploration of concepts of self-assessment and encouraged me to write about them, but sadly died before I could present him with any results. His alert mind and incisive comments would, I am sure, have helped me steer clear of many subsequent errors.

Work on the present book began during my sabbatical stay at the University of Konstanz in the spring semester of 1999. Special thanks must go to Professor Gottfried Seebaß for providing me with office space and access to the wonderful library there, and to his co-workers, Margit Sutrop and Holmer Steinfath, for stimulating discussions. Comments and criticisms

Many of the ideas expressed in this book started to take shape in articles that I wrote in Icelandic which were published in two collections of my philosophy papers: *Þroskakostir* [*Ways to Maturity*] (1992), and *Af tvennu illu* [*The Lesser of Two Evils*] (1997). Different sections of the book incorporate material already published in the following articles (see bibliography for further details): 'Why Persons Need Jealousy', *The Personalist Forum* (1996), 'Stephan G. Stephansson: A Philosophical Poet, a Poetic Philosopher', *Canadian Ethnic Studies* (1997), 'Casual Sex Revisited', *Journal of Social Philosophy* (1998), 'Self-Respect, *Megalopsychia*, and Moral Education', *Journal of Moral Education* (1998) (with kind permission from Taylor & Francis Ltd), 'Liberating Moral Traditions: Saga Morality and Aristotle's

Last, but not least, I would like to thank my wife, Chia-jung Tsai, for her care and advice, and my son, Hlér, to both of whom this book is dedicated.

1

MAPPING OUT THE FIELD

1.1 Introduction

My boss's nephew, and incidentally also a good friend of mine, gets promotion in my company just because he is the boss's nephew, while I, a much better qualified candidate, am left behind to sweat in a low-ranking post. At the school fair, only Kate's poster is chosen to hang in the hall although Betsy's poster was at least equally well done. Cindy, who catches her lover *in flagrante delicto* with another girl, feels her world has crumbled to dust. Are Cindy, Betsy, and I morally justified in experiencing *jealousy* or is that emotion invariably the sign of a malicious mind? Jack has made considerable personal sacrifices to help an ailing relative whom others, nearer and closer to the poor fellow, had left in the lurch. Is Jack morally justified in taking *pride* in his deeds, as well as expecting and demanding some external recognition of his efforts, or would that be the sign of a deadly sin?

This book has two main objectives. The first is to explore what, generally speaking, constitutes a moral justification of an emotion and how such a justification is connected to the notion of moral and emotional excellence. The second is to give the two emotions that figure in the examples above, both traditionally vituperated as psychologically debilitating and morally flawed, a more sympathetic hearing. These emotions are *pride* – or *pridefulness* as I shall call it, by focusing on one of the many different uses of the word 'pride' – and *jealousy*. How often have we not heard pride proscribed as the root of all vice, and jealousy as one of its distasteful concomitants? My aim is, by contrast, to show that we have been much too hard on emotions which we have not properly understood, and that both these so-called *negative* emotions can, in the proper dosage, be seen as virtues or as ingredients in virtues: as parts of a good human life. To put it as succinctly as possible, I challenge the received wisdom about pride by claiming that a *certain kind* of pride, namely pridefulness, is *psychologically* necessary for the formation and sustenance of personhood, and also *morally* necessary for a self-respectful person who wants to live a well-rounded virtuous life. In addition, I argue that jealousy is necessary to maintain pride and self-respect.

Although I shall avoid using the cumbersome and semi-technical term 'pridefulness' in the sequel, where it is possible to do so without causing misunderstanding, it should be made clear from the start that my ultimate defence is of pride qua pridefulness (see ss 3.3–4.1).

As I noted in the preface, everybody is interested in the emotions. From an early age, our own and others' emotions take up a substantial part of everyday conversation; they guide our actions, inform our evaluations, and kindle our interest in the mundane and the sublime: in everything from eating porridge to enjoying art. Without emotions there might be a number of Mr Spocks of *Star Trek* fame around, but surely no human beings. Fortunately, in recent years philosophical interest in the emotions has reached new heights after sinking to its nadir for decades. Although the emotions, in general, have received renewed attention, much less has been written about the 'negative' emotions specifically – and by 'negative' let me here tentatively mean those emotions typically evaluated negatively from a moral perspective; there are other uses abroad as we shall later learn. A notable exception is Gabriele Taylor's *Pride, Shame, and Guilt*, an insightful if somewhat disconcerting study of those three emotions and their interrelationships.[1] A few papers have appeared about specific 'negative' emotions, such as Daniel M. Farrell's important analyses of jealousy and Jerome Neu's recent reappraisal of pride.[2] Most of these studies, however, have been primarily conceptual and have not come much to terms with the substantive moral standing of the 'negative' emotions in question, except as a side issue. The book which perhaps comes closest to my orientation, and from which I have learnt a great deal, is John Casey's *Pagan Virtue*,[3] but he is more concerned there with the traditional virtues and vices than with (their connected) emotions. In addition, there is the steadily growing mountain of literature on 'emotional intelligence', but it tends, typically, to evade questions of the value or disvalue of 'negative' emotions. The imbalance of these evasions must, I think, be rectified.

In the field of emotion research, too many a cobbler has tenaciously stuck to his last: a lamentable state of affairs in a field that cannot and should not by its very nature be the privileged domain of any one discipline. Unfortunately, philosophical and psychological explorations of the general nature of emotions, or even of the same specific emotions, frequently seem to run on parallel tracks with only the barest mutual acknowledgement. The different camps seem, so to speak, to be building similar pyramids on both sides of a huge ocean without much idea of what is happening on the other side.[4] Since I think of the field of emotions as a buffer zone into which incursions can and should be made from various sides, the focus of the present book is interdisciplinary. I do not intend to hide that I am a philosopher; that will be amply evidenced by the tenor of my discussion and the choice of topics. For instance, I believe that my understanding of emotions has benefited from my earlier engagement with

political issues, and that an influx of ideas from political philosophy as well as from 'pure' moral theory can aid us in looking at particular emotions from a moral point of view. After all, no moral concerns are completely apolitical and no political ones are extra-moral. This belief will be reflected in the book's approach. However, I want to bring to bear as many insights from other areas as possible: from psychology, education, literature, and, last but not least, anecdotal evidence from daily life. I believe, like Heraclitus, that even in the kitchen 'divinities' are present.[5] Most of the important lessons of life I have learnt at the kitchen table: first in my parents' house; later with my wife. It is also more than a half-truth that the best descriptions of emotions tend to be provided by artists rather than academics.[6] More perhaps can be learnt about the subtleties of emotions by a careful reading of the poetry of Stephan G. Stephansson,[7] or the novels of Dostoevsky, than through any scholarly treatise. I shall be adding tonal shadings from various literary sources to my arguments. However, among my frequent fellow travellers will also be the academic philosopher *par excellence*, Aristotle. Generally speaking, the reader will, I believe, gain more from a synthetic, interdisciplinary approach than from a more narrowly-defined focus, even if that may at times mean sacrificing depth for breadth. Moreover, since I consider my exploration of specific emotions and their cultivation to be of general importance, I hope that my book will be accessible to more readers than those who are already well versed in psychology or philosophy.

My interest in the emotions has been heightened by my employment as a professor of philosophy in a recently established department of education with a strong philosophical orientation. In such a department, questions about the emotional schooling of the young are continually relevant and pressing. We need to know what the emotions are, how they are formed and cultivated and, in so far as they are psychologically under our jurisdiction, which of them are morally justified. 'Is children's jealousy amenable to any rational control?', 'Should pride be nourished or uprooted?', 'Under what circumstances, if any, can envy be non-malicious?' are just a few examples of the questions crowding in. When preparing lecture notes for my classes in moral education, I realised how the old ideal of education as character formation had given way in educational theory to scepticism about moral education in general and schooling of the emotions in particular. This scepticism seemed to be propagated by a wave of psychological theories that either postponed the systematic cultivation of morally commendable emotions to 'later stages' in the child's life, or simply reduced the emotions to steam rising up from internal kettles, mostly, if not wholly, impenetrable to reason. The subject of moral and emotional education had not only *not* been *learnt* in recent years, but had rather, in a fundamental sense, been *unlearnt* by teacher-training students, leading to teacher neutrality and parental uncertainty on these important issues. David Carr aptly refers to

this situation as a 'conspiracy of silence'[8] (see further in s. 6.4). What the textbooks in pedagogy and educational psychology provided for my students about the nature and cultivation of emotions was so meagre that, without other resources, they were bound to starve on it. That this Spartan diet was not what famous educational theorists such as Piaget or Kohlberg had intended is more or less beside the point. It is often more relevant in practice to consider what the secondary (or even the watered-down 'tertiary') literature tells university students about the ideas of important thinkers than to concentrate on what may be revealed by careful scholarly exegesis of these ideas themselves. I would not have written the present book if I did not believe that at least some of the things I have to say are of practical significance for moral education.

Philosophical views tend to be shackled together with the heavy chains of social and personal history. It is probably not just coincidental that my historical background, as an Icelander, is in a proud, assertive ethical tradition of 'saga morality'[9] which accepts other-regard and self-regard as necessarily intertwined and understands morality as rules of demeanour and conduct in a society made up of free, sovereign persons. If we bring up the question of the moral justifiability of emotions as a question about what it really means to be a person, that is, one who can make claims, who can incur and acknowledge obligations, can be wronged, can be the object of and can reciprocate love, respect, hatred, contempt, etc.,[10] then a range of interesting considerations starts to emerge that may threaten those accounts which automatically saddle pride and jealousy with a bad name. In this emphasis on the formation, maintenance, and recognition of personhood we can see the glimmering of a point that will be variously explored and pressed in the sequel.

For convenience of exposition, I shelve a direct defence of the emotions of pride(fulness) and jealousy themselves until chapters 4 and 5. The rest of chapter 1 will instead concentrate on a number of preliminaries. A writer wrestling *in vacuo* with issues such as the moral legitimacy of jealousy, or the various emotional manifestations of love, is likely to encounter severe trials. To make progress with such an inquiry, his general point of departure must be clear; he must have a fair idea of what an emotion is. I proceed in the following section with the briefest of surveys of recent emotion theory, especially of the cognitive kind to which I essentially adhere. Rather than opening new vistas, that section aims at a short survey of the present state of research. A major critical synthesis of current research is to be found in Aaron Ben-Ze'ev's recent book, *The Subtlety of Emotions*.[11] I refer the reader to that work for a clear, interdisciplinary overview of emotion theory and penetrating studies of various particular emotions. To avoid *longueurs* about general issues in emotion research, I mostly confine my discussion of that area to those points where I take exception, or believe that I have something to add, to Ben-Ze'ev's treatment. Notice that section 1.2 is primarily

written for readers not yet initiated into the basics of emotion theory. I recommend those better versed in the field to browse quickly through it, or simply skip it and go straight to section 1.3 which addresses some of the problems inherent in the cognitive theories of the emotions (concerns about methodology, the components of emotion, etc.). Section 1.4 then aims to clarify what it means to be responsible for one's emotions, and to classify them according to rationality and moral appropriateness, and as either 'positive' or 'negative', as well as to offer some initial suggestions about the justification of 'negative' emotions.

No scholarly treatment of the emotions must stray too far afield from everyday experiences. That is a crucial mission statement for any 'Aristotelian naturalist at heart', as I described myself in the preface. In order to understand and evaluate the emotions, we must know what people are like: what they think, say, and do in everyday encounters. In his ethical writings, Aristotle famously synthesised an account of moral virtues and emotions by considering virtue expressed in fine emotion as well as in fine action, and treating emotions as morally evaluable aspects of character. This is why the recent resurgence of Aristotelianism and the current fad for so-called *virtue ethics* may seem to bode well for the reinstitution of the emotions into moral and educational discourse. Indeed, some writers think that the moral significance of the emotions can only be adequately captured in terms of such a virtue-based conception of morality.[12] I agree that virtue ethics has done a lot of good for emotion research, if only by reintroducing a value-laden focus on the emotions. In the end, however, I shall be tempted to reject virtue-based ethics as a general touchstone by which to judge the moral soundness of our actions and emotions, opting instead for a sophisticated form of utilitarianism.

In spite of my (rather subtle) differences with virtue ethicists, I agree with their presupposition that we need a touchstone before we can start to take measurements. As Martha Nussbaum puts it, one cannot 'say what role emotions should play in morality […] without defending an overall normative view'.[13] This is why I have written chapter 2 about the credentials of a general moral theory: a chapter that I hope the reader will not view as a distracting detour from the main line of discussion, but rather as a crucial backdrop for the moral assessment of particular emotions. Perhaps the only serious strategic weakness in Ben-Ze'ev's monumental work mentioned above is that he does not precede his discussions of the moral standing of different emotions by an argued defence for a substantive moral theory. Thus, the springboard from which his evaluations are launched is unclear. While it may be true that the theoretical differences between general moral standpoints are often over-emphasised and their similarities under-appreciated, there are surely more moral theories to choose from than there are snakes in Iceland. I should not be understood as claiming here that the reader will not glean enough from Ben-Ze'ev's

nuanced account of individual emotions, or from my defence of pride and jealousy, to be able to form his own coherent stance on the morality of emotions without a sophisticated understanding of moral theory; I am not raising a red flag for non-experts based on the intricacies of moral philosophy. Most readers, however, should be aware of enough cases of persons committing evil deeds and thinking evil thoughts because 'they feel so right', to sympathise with an attempt to give a moral view of the emotions a firm theoretical grounding.

More specifically, I discuss in chapter 2 the advantages of Aristotelian essentialism and a general naturalist approach to morality and the emotions, an exploration which leads me through the shortcomings of virtue ethics to the untapped sources of utilitarianism. In particular, I consider at length the way in which liberalism fails to guide satisfactorily our emotional life, and the way in which virtue ethics also fails to do so in times of emotional conflict, owing to its insensitivity to the ubiquity of tragic moments in human life.

In chapter 3 I then ponder the nature and conditions of moral and emotional excellence. As the reader will already have seen, my line of argument follows a deductive pattern: I move from general questions about the nature of emotions, via considerations of what constitutes a moral justification of emotions, to a discussion of the virtuous life. Only after having established these general points do I venture to descend to the particularities of the specific emotions under scrutiny. That transition takes place in this chapter. I begin by discussing personhood, integrity, and self-respect, and then, subsequently, shift the attention to an historically important character ideal: Aristotle's *megalopsychia*, his crown of the virtues. From the explication of that ideal then flows naturally a characterisation of pridefulness as concern with, and heightened sensitivity to, (simple) pride, shame, and external recognition.

'Is such sensitivity to be psychologically recommended or abhorred?' is the basic question in chapter 4, which develops and argues for the value of pridefulness, rejecting one by one the most common objections against it. The typical criticisms given, that pridefulness is a vestige from primitive 'shame-societies', that it makes a person dependent on moral luck, fosters respect for the extraordinary rather than the ordinary, and fails to pay heed to the virtue of humility, do not, on close inspection, detract from the merits of this emotion.

In chapter 5 I then attempt, similarly, to give jealousy its due. That can, however, only be done by relocating the emotion within its conceptual framework and, especially, by rethinking the relationship between jealousy and envy. Indeed, contrary to the almost general consensus in other, previous, accounts, I argue that jealousy is best seen as a certain type of envy. I acknowledge the importance of sexual jealousy, but also show why more lessons can be learnt about the moral standing of this emotion by

looking at it in non-sexual, but no less typical, contexts. When defending jealousy, I pay special attention to the way in which it needs to be contrasted with meanness and spite.

In chapter 6 I provide guidance as to how the emotions, in general, and pridefulness and jealousy, in particular, should be cultivated and schooled: What is the significance of early emotion education? Why do many reasonable people entertain lingering doubts about the feasibility of moral and emotional schooling? How can the emotions really be trained in practice? Is it possible to teach pridefulness and jealousy without inculcating arrogance and meanness? Of particular concern in this chapter is my argument that education for pride and jealousy need not be elitist: a pursuit which enlists the help of an unlikely ally, Nietzsche.

Finally, in chapter 7 I summarise the threads of the foregoing discussion. I also explain there why my defence of pride and jealousy does not necessarily apply to other commonly stigmatised emotions, some of which may be negative beyond redemption. Indeed, concerning the emotions of pride and jealousy themselves, it should be made clear at the outset, to avoid any premature misconstrual, that my objective is not to defend these two emotions in all cases. To be sure, there are instances of pride and jealousy which have no redeeming features whatsoever. My defence is that of *proper* pride (qua pridefulness) and *proper* jealousy, the fundamental idea being that both emotions *can* be experienced in the right circumstances towards the right objects and at the right time. That these emotions can also be improperly experienced does not, as such, tell against the plausibility of their moral justification, for, as the Latin has it, *abusus non tollit usum*: abuse is no argument against proper use.

This book is intended neither as a textbook nor as a literature survey. However, my discussion contains much polemical matter, and I ruthlessly ignore the message of Nietzsche's diatribe against those bad readers who, 'proceeding like plundering soldiers' pick up the few things that they can use from their interlocutors and disregard the rest.[14] While I do not pretend to have recorded every point in which I agree or disagree with previous accounts of the topics under discussion, I repeatedly delve into the existing literature to seek support, or polemical targets, for my own views. There are two simple reasons for this method, neither of which is, I hope, merely a camouflage for the old truth that criticising others' arguments is easier than formulating one's own. First, given the relatively wide audience for which this book is aimed, it is necessary to provide a feel of the existing literature. Second, I am a firm believer in J. S. Mill's view that one's opinions are never sharpened to a finer edge than when they collide with those of others.[15] Thus, coming to grips with what previous authors have said becomes a helpful stage in the process of formulating one's own coherent stance and of giving the reader a taste of the challenges it faces.

1.2 Cognitive theories and their precursors

Over the centuries, a fair diversity of opinion has been generated on the nature of emotions. What seems at first sight to be a relatively straightforward definitional problem turns out to encompass various distinguishable, if interrelated, questions. Three of the most significant ones are: (i) To which conditions or mental states should we refer as emotions? (ii) What characterises emotions and sets them apart from other states of experience? (iii) How do we distinguish between different emotions in ourselves and in others? Caution is even required in formulating these theoretical starting-points in order not to load the questions against any of the many emotion theories. Notice, for example, that I did not ask which 'psychological conditions' count as emotions, for many will argue that there is nothing essentially *psychological* about them at all. To avoid offending anyone at the outset, one is also well advised to refrain from references to 'behaviour patterns', 'cognitions', or 'physiological conditions'. 'State of experience' may be about the only term sufficiently neutral to forestall accusations of question-begging. Let us, at any rate, understand the term provisionally in a neutral-enough way.

An exhaustive list of states passing as emotions cannot be given in reply to the first question. If we compare lists of 'standard', 'indubitable', or 'paradigmatic' emotions compiled by different writers, we find at their interface the likes of embarrassment, shame, sympathy, compassion, pity, grief, pride, indignation, anger, fear, envy, jealousy, joy, sadness, and remorse. On some lists, pleasure-in-others' misfortune, disgust, avarice, and sexual desire appear (to give a few examples), while on others they are missing. It is often unclear whether such omissions are intended or incidental. Additionally, there is the problem of individuation which concerns a range of conditions such as romantic love, friendship, laziness, and considerateness, which some writers treat as individual emotions but others as concatenations of various emotional responses. For instance, there might be a case for arguing that *love* is not a single emotion but rather a common denominator for various emotions and dispositions. A person in love is aggrieved when the object of his love is hurt, jealous when the beloved one starts showing a third party undue attention, joyful when his love is requited, etc. Those points granted, the poet Swift would have been making an important theoretical observation when he wrote:

> Love why do we one passion call
> When 'tis a compound of them all?

To complicate matters further, there may exist specific individual emotions which nevertheless only appear as compounds of other more 'basic' emotions while not being reducible to them (see s. 1.3). Indeed, I argue later that this is the case with jealousy.

Finally, not far removed from our emotions lurk our moods. R. C. Solomon aptly, if somewhat cheekily, describes *moods* as 'metaphysical generalizations of the emotions':[16] If I am (non-pathologically) depressed or simply 'in a bad mood', I feel sad, but my sadness may not be about anything in particular. This lack of object or intentionality distinguishes moods from emotions in principle, but the dividing line may not always be as clear in practice.[17] Exactly what should be included in and what excluded from the list of particular emotions, and why, must remain a matter for further debate, mostly outside the purview of the present study. However, I do have a little more to say about taxonomy and the conceptual methodology of emotion studies in section 1.3.

When talking about the various emotions, it is helpful to consider in each case whether we are referring to them as *episodic* or as *dispositional* states. The episodic ones are occurrent, that is, states with determinate durations: 'John is jealous of Peter *now*, because Peter's paper was accepted for publication while John's was rejected'. John may also be said to be jealous of Peter tomorrow and the next day, for this or some other reason, with the use of the term 'jealousy' still being episodic. We could, however, also be tempted to say 'John is by nature a jealous person', thus shifting the focus of the term from an occurrence to a disposition: John has a strong tendency to experience jealousy in various circumstances. Such dispositional uses seem to be conceptually parasitic on the episodic ones, but dispositional emotions are nonetheless interesting in themselves and may involve references to more than one episodic emotion (for instance, pridefulness qua disposition to both simple pride and shame; see s. 3.3). Dispositional emotions should not only be distinguished from episodic ones but also from both background emotions and moods. *Background emotions* are persisting emotions, but often unnoticed unless certain conditions bring them into consciousness.[18] A person could be mourning the loss of a spouse here and now (sadness as an episodic emotion); this sadness might continue to mark and pervade his character for the rest of his life without being consciously noticed all the time (background sadness); the person might also have a strong tendency to experience sadness over misfortunes small or large (sadness as a dispositional emotion), and finally, he could simply be 'objectlessly' sad or depressed as explained earlier (mood rather than emotion).

So much for the complexities of trying to respond to question (i) above. As to questions (ii) and (iii), the answers to those are usually found combined in full-fledged theories of emotion. Holding the field in the early and middle part of this century were, on the one hand, *sensory theories* of emotion and, on the other hand, *behaviour theories*. Both are difficult to summarise in a few paragraphs, as are the *cognitive theories*, which are discussed later in this section.[19] The reader should be forewarned that such summaries cannot avoid trading in oversimplifications (summaries of summaries) and references to 'straw men'. Given the variety of accounts

subsumed under each of these theories, what one risks describing in the end is some sort of a 'weighed-average view', not attributable to any particular thinker. Behaviourism is likely to be the hardest hit in this regard since there are almost as many behaviourisms as there are behaviourists. But as the uninitiated reader needs some guiding lights, the following will have to do.

According to the *sensory theories*, what characterises a state of experience as an emotion and individuates it from others is its 'feel': the presence in consciousness of a felt quality, wholly (and only) accessible to introspection. You are jealous when you experience a certain unique feeling that only you know, a feeling that distinguishes itself from other feelings with which you also have first-hand acquaintanceship, such as those of shame or anger. Sensory theories differ among themselves as to the origin or cause of the relevant feelings, whether they are primarily *psychological* or *physiological*. Is shame an 'inner feel' of an essentially *mental* nature or is it simply the perception of *physiological* processes: of blood running through your veins making your cheeks red, etc? The philosopher David Hume is often quoted as a representative of the former variety, and the psychologist William James (along with the physiologist Carl Georg Lange) as the author of the second. A commonly cited guide to Hume's view of emotions is Book II of his *Treatise of Human Nature*.[20] However, many contemporary Hume scholars consider the views expressed therein uncharacteristic blunders, since what he says elsewhere about the emotions is both more sophisticated and more in line with modern cognitive theories. William James's view is spelled out in his *Principles of Psychology*,[21] and other writings.[22] James's adherence to sensory theories is less controversial than Hume's. In a famous article written in 1884, he asserts that 'the bodily changes follow directly the PERCEPTION of the exciting fact, and that our feeling of the same changes as they occur IS the emotion'. Not only that; it is possible that 'no shade of emotion, however slight, should be without a bodily reverberation as unique, when taken in its totality, as is the mental mood itself'.[23] As opposed to the sensory theories, which equate emotions with feelings, *behaviour theories* claim that emotions have nothing whatsoever to do with inner feels, but rather with behaviour patterns. You are, for instance, jealous when you behave in a certain way: when you respond to external stimuli in a fashion characteristic of that emotion.

It must be said that both these theories of emotion count as somewhat passé nowadays after numerous writers have criticised them steadily for decades. Let us rehearse cursorily some common objections. As to sensory theories, the first point is that the method of introspecting lived experiences, suggested there as a reliable guide to our emotional life, has failed to prove its worth in scientific experiments – so much so, in fact, that it now counts as the *bête noire* of most psychologists and philosophers. Its results turned out, on most accounts, to be hopelessly subjective and incommensurable. One person might describe his experience of remorse as a pain in his stomach,

another as a load on his back, the third as feeling conscience-stricken, etc. The same person could even describe the feel of the same emotion differently at different times. The 'hard data of consciousness' proved not to be so hard after all. Not only was there something *contingently* murky and indecisive about the results of such introspection, but, after Wittgenstein, philosophers began to suspect that, qua scientific method, introspection was *inherently* misguided as an attempt to describe allegedly 'private' objects of consciousness, lacking public criteria for identity and individuation. If one person forms a theatre group, who can then be his prompter? These radical Wittgensteinian doubts go hand in hand with a view of language as a tool of communication rather than as a camera depicting inner reality, and with a rejection of the possibility of forming a 'private language' by means of which we could systematically and coherently describe the 'beetles in our own little boxes': the inner experiences to which no one else can, in principle, have access.[24]

A second, but related, point is this: irrespective of methodological doubts, there simply does not seem to be any necessary connection between particular emotions and particular sensory states. Neither introspection nor other more 'sophisticated' methods have revealed any sensory experiences that uniquely pick out an emotion such as fear, anger, or joy, and this is evidently more than the fault of the methods. At one time, a dry mouth may be an emotional sign; at another it may be caused by simple thirst. Well-documented physiological research points in the same direction: in tests where bodily reactions were mimicked by the use of drugs, subjects turned out to be unable to distinguish phenomenologically between the three apparently diverse emotions mentioned above, that is, until they were tipped off as to what the *reason for* (as distinct from the *cause of*) the emotion might be. Then those cued to react angrily reported themselves to be experiencing anger, and so forth.[25]

Third, the sensory theorists' under-appreciation of *reasons* for emotions may betray an inadequate grasp of logical connections. For a devout Humean, it is simply a matter of contingent fact, and quite an inexplicable one at that, that we only experience remorse with respect to actions which we have already performed, would have been able to refrain from performing, and now consider morally defective.[26] Why could it not so happen at some point in time that we feel remorse with regard to a future act, or one which we consider morally praiseworthy? The sensory theorist has no means within his repertoire to exclude such a possibility. As will become apparent in the sequel, however, the right thing to say is that such events are beyond the bounds of logic. The relevant emotion is determined by its objects by necessity: a way that has nothing to do with its characteristic or uncharacteristic 'feel'.

Combining this insight with the earlier objections leads to yet another observation: a person can be mistaken about his emotions in a sense that is

ruled out in case of mere feelings. Compare 'I wasn't ready to accept it at the time but only realised it later that when my grandma died, leaving me all her money, deep down I was overjoyed although I thought I was sad' with 'I thought I had a toothache last night, but now I realise I didn't'. While the first statement works, there is something mysterious about the second statement, unless of course it simply means that the pain I experienced last night turned out to originate somewhere else than in a tooth: in my gum or tongue perhaps. One cannot be mistaken about a mere feeling, like the existence of pain, as one can be about the occurrence of an emotion. The statement 'I felt as if I were in pain', written by an early twentieth century neo-romantic poet in Iceland, was thus rightly held up for ridicule.

Furthermore, emotions can disappear with newly-gained knowledge, whereas mere feelings cannot. Once I realise that what I did to you in the past was morally sound, and not shameful as I had previously imagined, I typically stop being ashamed. By contrast, a person waking up after an operation, complaining of a pain in his leg, does not stop feeling pain as soon as he realises that the leg has been amputated. Admittedly, a person suffering from pain may experience the pain more or less intensely after gaining knowledge of its causes. One of the reasons why many doctors are notoriously reluctant to prescribe pain medication for infants may be their belief that suffering caused by physiological pain does not lie so much in the sensory perception of that pain as in its interpretation as a sign of an underlying disorder. Since infants do not interpret pain in this way, their pain-experiences are not thought to be as serious as those of adults.[27] If I am told that the pain in my chest stems from indigestion rather than the onset of a heart attack, I may worry less about the pain and gradually notice it less. However, if it is a real physiological pain, it does not disappear immediately upon my hearing the good news, and, even if it did, the reason would be causal rather than logical. All in all, one can safely say that although emotions may typically and even essentially *involve* feelings, emotions *are* not feelings – a conclusion which has made sensory theories fall into desuetude.[28]

As a general philosophy of mind, behaviourism has long been considered suspect by the majority of the philosophical community. Since criticism has revealed the weakness of the foundations of behaviourism in general, not much needs to be said here specifically about the *behaviour theory* of emotion.[29] The two-tiered objection commonly levelled against this theory is a rather straightforward one: first, an emotion can exist unaccompanied by any specific behaviour pattern (however common their coexistence may be), and, second, genuine-looking emotion behaviour may be displayed without the relevant emotion. An angry person will typically shout, clench his fists and grind his teeth, but it seems naive to hold that one cannot possibly be angry without showing any of these external signs. The emotion might be submerged, or the person strong-willed enough to hold it in and avoid

expressing it in the open. The behaviourist might answer that the emotion of anger need not be identified with angry behaviour but simply with a *disposition* (repressed or not) to anger-behave. However, the recourse to dispositions jeopardises the explanatory value of the theory. If it cannot be shown that the disposition to anger-behave is, if nothing else, displayed in inconspicuous but measurable signs such as muscle trembling or twitches, the talk of dispositions sounds rather vacuous. However, the invariable existence of such signs has not been supported by any scientific data. Memory reports – for what they are worth – of people who were wholly paralysed by curare and without any muscular activity whatsoever even suggest that they nevertheless experienced emotions.[30] As an explanation, then, the recourse to dispositions has become redolent of the infamous 'explanation' expressed in one of Molière's plays that opium makes you sleep because of its soporific power.

The second tier of the objection concerns feigned behaviour. If an emotion such as anger is literally the same as a certain behaviour pattern, what are we to say about the person who pretends to anger-behave: clenching fists, grinding teeth, etc., but does not really experience the emotion? (That feigning an emotion can *lead to* or *bring about* its sincere experience is an educationally important matter, see s. 6.3, but irrelevant here.) It seems impossible to distinguish between genuineness and pretence in this respect without reference to mental states, which would undermine the behaviourist point; unless, that is, one wants to claim that feigned behaviour will always lack some detectable signs of genuineness, thus betraying itself in the end. Then, however, the discussion might take an unexpected turn in the direction of aesthetics: How good can acting be? In the end, it seems, one can always cite a Laurence Olivier as a final proof of the imperfections of behaviourist emotion theory.

The foregoing criticisms notwithstanding, there are grains of truth in both sensory and behaviourist theories of emotion: emotions are typically accompanied by feelings, and they commonly beget certain kinds of behaviour. However, in a viable general theory, both the behaviour patterns and the feelings must be kept in their proper places as handmaids and not allowed to give themselves the air of mistresses. Emotions are not the same as behaviour or dispositions to behave, and it is almost a truism in recent philosophical literature that they are not feelings either. Whereas feelings have no reference beyond themselves, emotions have a 'direction': an object, a focus. Saying 'I'm angry' is elliptical for 'I'm angry *about x*', or 'angry *that x*', where *x* signifies the reason for my anger, for example: 'I'm angry that you showed up drunk for my birthday party'. Notice that the *reason* need not be the *cause* of my anger. Maybe I became angry because I had spent a sleepless night preparing for the party. Furthermore, your showing up drunk might have caused me to be angry about something else, for instance the fact that my sister got married to a jerk like you.[31]

Feelings, such as physical discomfort after a sleepless night or euphoria after a delicious meal, can sometimes create their own objects, randomly seeking out a place for themselves like the will-o-the-wisp on a ship's mast, when it seems as if it was the mast which created the glow. This does not change the fact that without a 'mast' the 'rays' can never become an emotion, nor does it detract from the reality of the experienced emotion. I *was* angry with you in that birthday party, not only sleepless. Saying to you 'Sorry, I wasn't really angry, just sleepy' would be an inappropriate apology. However, I could apologise later on by saying that I realise now that my anger was irrational (because you were not so drunk after all) or morally unfitting (because I had told everyone beforehand that this would be a rave), and that I had only experienced and exhibited anger *because* of sleeplessness.

Observations such as these characterise a major advance in the academic analysis of emotions made by so-called *cognitive theories*. According to these theories, emotions are intentional states and have propositional objects in the sense that what the emotion is 'about', 'of', 'for', 'at', or 'to' can in principle be specified propositionally. The relevant emotion is then given by its propositional content, and such content is characterised by what the agent takes his relations to be vis-à-vis the object(s) of the emotion. Only if certain appreciations of these relations are in place can we, logically, be said to have a particular emotion. Thus, to feel fear, for example, you must consider yourself in the presence, or about to be in the presence, of that which can harm you; to feel remorse you must deem a past action that was under your voluntary control morally defective, etc. Hence, the primary step in identifying and differentiating specific emotions becomes that of disclosing their *logical conditions*: the conditions which must be satisfied for the relevant emotion to be logically possible.

The rapidly growing literature on cognitive theories is not fully homogeneous. In most accounts, emotions are said to presuppose both factual beliefs and evaluations. Some go so far as to say that emotions not only *involve* evaluations, but *are* evaluations. (I shall say more about this tangled topic in the following section.) Thus, a special strand of 'evaluative theories' might perhaps be distinguished when mapping out the cognitive-theory landscape. Incidentally, that strand is no modern invention but harks back all the way to the Stoics who conceived of emotions as recently formed false judgements about the goodness or badness of states of affairs. In Stoic theory, all such judgements are necessarily false because each event in the world is to be considered morally neutral, taking place within an inexorably deterministic world-system. Feeling guilty is judging that you have wronged someone, but Stoic therapy makes you realise that no one ever wrongs anybody, because no actions are truly voluntary. Eventually, the wise person will rid himself of all emotions and reach the perfect state of Stoic equanimity.

There are striking similarities between the Stoic conception of emotion and that of Robert C. Solomon, a leading modern proponent of cognitive theories. To be sure, Solomon is not a hard determinist and does not think that all emotions are inherently wrong-headed. He claims, however, that emotions are normative *judgements*:

> 'I am angry at John for taking […] my car' *entails* that I believe that John has somehow wronged me […] The (moral) judgment entailed by my anger is not a judgment *about* my anger […] My anger *is* that judgment.[32]

The problem about this formulation is that by its concentration on the *cognitive* element of emotion, it seems to overlook another equally important element: the *conative* one.[33] Being angry with John for taking my car is more than believing (and making a normative judgement) that in doing so John has wronged me. I might believe that and still not be angry, for instance, if I did not care a whit whether my car was stolen or not. What is required here is some kind of concern about the offence. As Ben-Ze'ev puts it: 'Emotions arise only when we care'.[34] Other cognitive theorists usually recognise this by saying that an emotion is a combination of a *belief* and a *concern* (desire or aversion): here, the belief that John has stolen my car accompanied by the desire that my car should not be stolen. In addition to *belief* (or *belief* plus *evaluation*, when these are kept separate) and *concern*, some cognitive theorists want to add *affect* as yet another necessary component of emotion: no one can thus be (episodically) jealous unless some kind of 'botherment' has attached itself to other aspects of the emotion.[35] Another alternative would be to see the conative element as explaining the 'affective side' of emotions without the need for a new independent component. If one's desire is frustrated, must one not necessarily feel bothered? The 'botherment' may, however, be expressed in a variety of ways: by feelings that vary between individuals, feelings that vary within the same individual at different times, or even 'affects' that are unfelt because they are repressed in our subconscious. If this suggestion, to which I shall return in the following section, holds water, sensory theories would be right in that 'affects' are necessarily involved in emotions, although these 'affects' need not be conscious, nor – as mentioned earlier – follow the same pattern whenever a particular emotion is evoked.

Another general problem commonly noted with cognitive theories lies in the link which they require between emotions and *beliefs*. We are told that fear always goes hand in hand with acknowledged beliefs about danger, resentment with acknowledged beliefs about unfair treatment, and so on. Although this may be true in most of our emotional experiences, it is not always so. Sometimes emotions are in conflict with avowed beliefs. While it is true that emotions *can*, and often *do*, disappear with newly

gained knowledge, a change in belief does not always guarantee a change in emotion. Although I realise that what I did to you in the past was morally sound and not shameful, as I had previously imagined, I do not *necessarily* stop being ashamed. Admittedly, in such cases the relevant emotion may be irrational, but why should a mental state be any less real for that reason? Cheshire Calhoun has tried to work out a sophisticated version of cognitive theory, which is sensitive to the fact that though *some* cognitive element must be built into emotion, it need not be a belief or a judgement.[36] Calhoun uses the following examples:

> Tess has a spider phobia. Spiders make her skin crawl and she jerks out of their way, pleading for someone else to kill them. Yet Tess believes spiders are harmless and knows enough spider biology to back up this belief.
>
> Raised in a conservative household, Tess acquired, among other beliefs, the belief that homosexuality is unnatural and immoral. But in college, both friends and professors challenged this. After extensive discussion and reflection, Tess came to believe that homosexuality is neither unnatural nor immoral. But several years later, she suddenly discovered that a good friend is a lesbian and she experienced feelings of shock and revulsion.[37]

In Calhoun's view, dissonance can occur between our *belief system*, comprising a set of reflectively held, articulable judgements, and our more general *cognitive system* which also includes pre-reflectively held claims and an unarticulated framework for interpreting the world – a system that may, for instance, be partly the product of childhood conditioning. To have an emotion is not necessarily to believe x, but rather to see the world as x, whether or not this interpretive 'seeing as … ' ever emerges in our reflective belief system. Thus Tess's emotions channel her cognitive life down well-worn paths, although these remain hidden and would not be accepted by her as her beliefs.

Robert C. Roberts shares the same orientation as Calhoun regarding possible emotion–belief conflict and comes up with a similar, if even more subtle, analysis.[38] As Roberts puts it, what emotions and beliefs have in common is propositional content. If A is angry with B, it is either because A *believes B* has culpably offended or *sees B* as having done so. Roberts invokes here the notion of a 'construal'. To return to Calhoun's example, Tess may *construe* spiders as harmful although she *believes* they are not. A construal in this sense is the grasping *of* something (here spiders) *in* some terms ('harmful creature'). Roberts refers to Wittgenstein's famous example of the same image being seen either as a duck or as a rabbit by dwelling on or attending to different aspects of it. To change from one to the other requires a gestalt switch, which can at times be difficult to master. Tess's

construals may have her in their grip, although she would deny the corresponding judgements. In other words, the construals have for her the appearance of truth, although she would not affirm their being true. The long and short of Roberts's analysis is that because construals form the necessary cognitive condition for an emotion's occurring, while judgements do not, emotions are better thought of as construals than beliefs.

The Calhoun–Roberts solution is not without problems of its own. What exactly is the epistemological standing of these construals? Emotions are intentional states with propositional contents. If the construals satisfy those criteria, it is difficult to see what distinguishes them in the end from ordinary beliefs, some of which may be vague or even hidden. Again, allow me to postpone further elaboration of a lingering problem in cognitive theories until the more critical exploration in section 1.3.

Instead, let me finish this brief survey with yet another open question, if only to remind the reader that there is still a lot more theoretical work to be done in this field. What distinguishes those beliefs (or if you prefer, construals) that form the basis of our emotions from the rest of our beliefs? I may have strong convictions about techniques and tactics in angling and car repairs – even strong enough to lead to physiological changes and disturbances – but I do not classify those beliefs into distinct categories related to the passions of the soul. It does not help much to say, as Ben-Ze'ev does, that our emotion-beliefs are more 'personal', expressing 'our profound values and attitudes',[39] for other types of beliefs (such as those about angling and car repairs) can also be deeply personal and profound. Annette Baier suggests – professedly drawing on Descartes and Freud – that the emotions have what she calls 'deep objects', derived from highly significant early experiences, objects which can only be properly understood by telling a biographical, associational story. A person's view, however important to him, about how best to arrange worms on a fishhook or how to fix brakes in a Volvo can be understood without considering the trajectory of his life. However, his revulsion when putting a cold earthworm into his mouth may only be understandable as the last link in a long chain going back to a fateful childhood experience such as the drinking of a foul-tasting liquid which looked like his mother's milk, or to the first realisation that one day he himself will be devoured by worms in his grave. The deep object may emanate from art and literature as well as from real events: from myths and horror stories that have left an indelible mark on the person's soul.[40] Ronald de Sousa suggests, somewhat similarly, that our emotional repertoire has its origin in 'paradigm scenarios' mediating between the past and the present. Every emotion is considered to be rooted in a dramatic situation or episode type associated with a characteristic feel. These paradigm scenarios, drawn from childhood experiences but later reinforced by the arts and culture to which we are exposed, provide both the characteristic object of the specific emotion-type and a set of typical responses.[41]

One question, however, immediately arises, namely: What if my disgust and your disgust turn out to have radically different 'deep objects', or to be rooted in radically different 'paradigm scenarios'; in what sense can we then talk about the *same kind* of disgust, or *disgust* at all as a separable emotion? It does not suffice here to insist that my disgust and yours will, nevertheless, share the same basic evaluative pattern although they may be connected, in actual experience, with various other beliefs and desires; for the invocation of the 'paradigm scenario' was meant precisely to help us specify what this pattern is. De Sousa seems to give in to relativism by accepting that the 'canons of normality according to which we must assess the rationality of emotions are ultimately *individual*'.[42] Baier tries to hold the line against relativism by claiming that it so happens that we inhabit a common physical and cultural world, and that this universality provides, at least to some extent, a 'common emotional world'.[43] While that answer is convincing up to a point, at least for those of us who share Aristotle's belief in inter-human 'grounding experiences' (see s. 2.1), we must remember that children experience anger, jealousy, pride, envy, and so forth from a relatively early age. It is rather implausible to suggest that they have all, by that time, gone through similar enough experiences – traumas, disappointments, and joys – to explain the universality of those emotions, though surely the deep objects or the paradigm scenarios must be somehow isomorphic in order to give rise to the same emotions. Hence, I still consider the question of what distinguishes emotion-beliefs from other types of beliefs – be it a single marker or more diverse and subtle differences – an unanswered one.

Despite the lack of uniformity among cognitive theories and the remaining problems which harass them, they have, arguably, signalled a major advancement in comparison with their predecessors. What should be noted here is that, notwithstanding the differences between them, all cognitive theories paint an intrinsically rational picture of human emotions. Having cut away the alleged dead wood of sensory and behaviourist theories, what emerges is a view harking back to the ancient Aristotelian conception of emotions as more or less intelligent ways of grasping situations, dominated by a desire. For Aristotle, as for recent cognitive theorists, emotions are seen as penetrable to reason: as rational states that change with our opinions, or as more irrational ones which can still, in principle, be brought to consciousness to be reflected upon and, if necessary, 'defused'. Instead of being beyond the bounds of reason, the emotions are placed right in the middle of reason's kingdom itself. Human nature is no longer seen as that of a divided creature, the inevitable battleground of reason and passion, but as that of an essentially, or at least an ideally, unified being.[44]

In addition to its similarities to contemporary emotion theory, Aristotle's general account of the emotions is highly impressive in its own right. Like contemporary theorists, Aristotle avoids treating emotions as irrational, uncontrolled, or essentially inappropriate responses to situations. Our

emotions may, at times, be unwarranted, but just as often they may be warranted. He especially develops this point in the *Nicomachean Ethics*, in which he argues that virtue (for instance, bravery and generosity) is largely a matter of feeling the right thing (of *re*action as well as of action); for instance, the brave individual is neither fearless nor overwhelmed by fear in a dangerous situation.[45] The emotions thus become central to his treatment of moral virtue and vice, in which virtue is famously defined as a mean of action *and* passions. In other words, just as the right deeds are to be performed in the right circumstances, Aristotle claims that our emotions should be appropriate to the situation: felt toward the right individual, at the right time, and in the right amount, being neither too violent nor too calm. He notes that what characterises many emotions is a strong moral belief about how oneself and others should act, and that in a good person there is ideal harmony between emotions, values, and actions. In his *Rhetoric*, too, much can be read about the structure and moral worth of particular emotions, and how lack of emotion can be as debilitating as its surfeit.[46] By seeing emotions as potential *virtues* or necessary ingredients in virtues, Aristotle's theory of emotion plays a substantial role in his general moral theory.

The link Aristotle forges between *actions* and *emotions* (with both exemplifying potential virtues or vices) may strike the modern reader as somewhat odd at first glance as we are used to considering the latter less 'active' and 'intellectual' than the former – witness the entrenched distinction in ordinary language between 'actions' and 'passions'.[47] However, a closer look will reveal how blurred the division between the two is bound to be. A person, such as Nelson Mandela, languishing in his prison cell, cannot be said to have lost his virtue of benevolence just because he has little if any chance of displaying it through *action*, that is, not as long as the underlying *passion* (the relevant compassion) and the related disposition to act well is intact. Moreover, benevolent activities performed in everyday life tend to be inspired by compassion and related emotions. There is a strong case for saying, à la Aristotle, that talk about passions *and* actions simply directs our attention to different aspects of the same virtues or vices. One might even want to say that an occurrent emotion such as compassion is simply one kind of action (of the mind) which typically motivates another kind of action (of the body). What we should resist in this line of thought, however, is a temptation to which Solomon, for one, succumbs: that of explaining the difference between 'emotion-acts' and 'normal rational deliberate actions' by categorising the former as 'rash', 'hasty', and 'dogmatic'.[48] While it may be true that emotions are often brief and unstable, it does not follow that they have been hastily and dogmatically arrived at. For instance, it is unclear why an act of anger (qua judgement or qua bodily action motivated by anger) must necessarily count as more hasty and dogmatic than an action stemming from what Solomon would count as 'rational deliberation'. After all,

people commonly claim to have arrived, as a result of 'rational deliberation', at conclusions such as that it is wise to take up strenuous exercise at the age of 65, or to stop taking medicine prescribed by their doctor.

Cognitive theories have more to say in detail about the psychology of emotion than Aristotle; he, on the other hand, is stronger on the moral aspects of emotions. Combining these different insights helps to shed light on various problems which other emotion theories leave in the dark. I shall be making substantive use of these insights in what follows.

1.3 Taking stock: some critical comments on cognitivism

A well-known psychologist wrote in 1983 that there were signs that the 'cognitive wave' was on the wane.[49] However, news of its imminent death seems to have been rather premature at that time since cognitive theories still dominate emotion research within both philosophy and psychology. To the average reader, the vast majority of 'different' models and paradigms posited by psychologists conducting empirical research into the emotions may seem little more than variations on a common theme – the theme that *cognition* lies at the centre of emotion – with the other serious candidates of yore, such as pure sensory and behaviour theories, having been cast aside, much like an old hat.

The review in the previous section brought out many of the strengths of the cognitive theories. At the same time, it also indicated how they are still marred by a number of unresolved difficulties and internal conflicts. One is tempted to observe, ironically, that the virtues of cognitive theories would be overwhelming if they only had fewer vices to keep them company. The aim of the present section is to ameliorate, or at least to cast new light on, some of these 'vices', by bringing to bear on them insights from other areas of philosophical inquiry, particularly insights relating to the methodology of conceptual studies and the nature of moral language. Let me first say something about taxonomy, and then turn to the notion of basicness and the necessary components of emotion.

We have already seen how the lists compiled by different philosophers and psychologists of standard emotions only coincide to a limited extent. Everyone seems to have his own shopping trolley packed with different goods. Psychologists have located hundreds of emotion terms in the normal adult's vocabulary; including the so-called 'aesthetic emotions', and emotions describing alleged other-worldly experiences in religions East and West, adds even further to the disarray.[50] The complexities of the emotional landscape may tempt us to conclude, as Amélie Rorty does, that 'emotions do not form a natural class'.[51] Perhaps the 'passions of the soul' can only be classified according to family resemblances rather than essential defining criteria; the vast number of ill-defined emotion-terms, labels, and phrases referring to our various 'states of experience' points in that direction.

However, if such a conclusion is taken to mean that the classification of emotions is dependent simply on the vagaries of language in different societies and at different times, we are left with a disconcerting implication. For, arguably, the compassion felt for victims of misfortune in modern society is essentially the same kind of compassion as the soldiers in ancient Greece felt for the desolate Philoctetes, left to his own devices after being bitten by the serpent of Lemnos on that deserted island.[52] The *same kind* of compassion obviously does not mean that it must be compassion felt for the *same reason*, but simply that we moderns are able to identify our feelings with those of the soldiers, given the circumstances in which they found themselves, and to see Philoctetes' bad fate through their eyes.[53] The universality of emotions thus sets certain limits to a relativistic interpretation and makes abandoning the classification of the emotions according to some natural schema less enticing than it might otherwise seem.

Admittedly, this universality of emotions is not undisputed, and reference to the alleged inter-human understanding of emotions across cultural and temporal borders is seen by some as question-begging.[54] However, when anthropological evidence is presented for a non-universalist view – of unknown emotions appearing and others more familiar being absent in some 'distant' societies – its interpretation is typically marred by one or both of two common errors. It is supposed, first, that if there is no word '*x*' in the given remote language, *y*, which can be directly translated as the name of the emotion to which we refer as '*x*', then that emotion cannot exist among the speakers of *y*; second, it is taken for granted that a person cannot experience an emotion unless he attributes that emotion to himself. There is, however, no direct correlation between words and concepts. In contemporary Icelandic there is no word corresponding to the English term 'compassion' as distinct from 'sympathy'; they would both typically be referred to by the same common name, '*samúð*'.[55] Yet this does not mean that Icelanders cannot experience two distinguishable emotions, or that there are not other manoeuvres within the language to differentiate between the two, for example by calling compassion '*djúp samúð*' ('deep sympathy'). Moreover, as I shall discuss later in this section, people are commonly self-deceived about their emotions; self-attribution is not a necessary condition of the experience of an emotion.

To return to Rorty's conclusion above, much depends on what she means by a natural class. If she is referring to something like the periodic table of elements, she is probably right: emotions do not come with different atomic numbers. However, if we consider the everyday classification of natural phenomena into, say, rivers and brooks, mountains and hills, what she says becomes less plausible. There, our concepts are more 'open-textured' than those relating to natural kinds in the strict sense (such as the chemical element *gold*), not to mention the non-natural 'closed' concepts of mathematics and logic. In the case of geometrical concepts we can, for example,

give a strict rule prescribing the necessary and sufficient properties of a rect-angle, that is, we can fashion a complete definition which anticipates and settles once and for all every possible question of usage. In the case of most concepts of the natural, moral, and social sciences, however, this is not the case: the boundaries of the sets of things to which our concepts refer there do not typically constitute tight-shut compartments and are thus difficult to fix precisely.[56] However, this does not mean that our classification of those natural classes which do not constitute natural kinds in the strict sense, nor for that matter of moral and social concepts, cannot be more or less reason-able, more or less well argued-for, within the limits of the field. As Aristotle would be the first to remind us, we must in each field of inquiry plough with such oxen as we have.[57] The borderline flexibility of most of our everyday natural concepts does not imply essential contestability.[58] If what Rorty means is that emotions cannot be considered a natural class only because we cannot ascertain with the same precision whether a given state of experience constitutes emotion as whether a given sample from a mine constitutes gold, her conclusion is a non sequitur.[59]

However, rather than dismissing Rorty's remark out of hand, we should set it against the background of methodological considerations (or rather the lack thereof) in cognitive theories. A philosopher entering the field of emotion research from other areas will be somewhat taken aback by the paucity of 'meta-talk', something akin to meta-ethics or the methodological explorations conducted within philosophy of science, to be found there. Psychologists and (even) philosophers probing the various emotions usually get down to work without worrying too much – or so it seems – about the adequacy of the tools that they are employing. In spite of the demise of the 'ordinary-language conceptual analyses' of the 1950s and '60s, moral philosophers still spend considerable time ruminating over the nature of moral language and how moral truths are to be arrived at. They also have on hand a wealth of material on those issues from the time when meta-ethics ruled the day. So what should cognitive theorists learn from moral philos-ophers in this respect? What they could learn, I submit, from philosophers working within a broadly Aristotelian perspective, is that all satisfactory inquiries into the nature of open-textured concepts must be *critical* inquiries. In our world, concepts are formed for a purpose and have a point. The aim of conceptual studies is to argue critically what these points *are* and/or what they *should be*, in the light of our existing knowledge of human beings and their environment. In other words, it must be shown why the point of the given concept is or should be of interest to people, given their common human nature, and how the term designating the concept must be defined so as to correspond to this point.[60]

Suppose we want to define the term 'table'. What we do is to search for a function or a social need that the term is meant to fulfil. If someone insists on reserving the term 'table' for four-legged objects fulfilling this need, we

point out the arbitrariness of the distinction: why not also three-legged ones? For what reason, that is, should the language of 'table' be thought to mark out this particular distinction? If, on the other hand, the definition is so broad as to include tables and beds, we would say: 'If you use "table" in this way, you will have no term with which to refer specifically to objects you put your plates on at dinner, as distinct from those you sleep on at night', etc. Much the same can be seen to apply to 'jealousy' as to 'table' in the example above. What we need to do is to produce critical naturalistic arguments about how the term 'jealousy' should be defined for its use to be internally coherent and distinguishable from the meanings of other related terms.

As a starting point we should of course, as Aristotle proposed, collocate most of the possible *endoxa*, the conceptions or appearances of the 'many or the wise' about the given concept, work through the puzzles of contradictions in usage and beliefs, and then formulate a new account which we bring back to the appearances, trying to retain the truth of the greatest number and the most authoritative of these.[61] *At the outset* there is simply no other rational way to proceed. However, in the end we may be doing much more than 'respectfully tidying up ordinary usage', as Roberts describes his enterprise of defining 'emotion'.[62] It often happens that 'common usage fails to honour distinctions which themselves emerge only from an analysis of common usage',[63] or we realise that distinctions entrenched in ordinary language are in fact redundant. This is in no way mysterious: definitions are created to serve a purpose; they do not fall into our lap by chance. Let me make it quite clear, however, that I am not proposing a quest for an arbitrary, stipulative definition of jealousy. What we need to show, for jealousy or any other emotion, is its point or purpose in human relations, and then to argue critically for a particular definition of the emotion that best conveys this point. In the end, what hopefully emerges is a definition that is *objective* in the sense of being objectively useful to those interested in certain relations between human beings, the reference being fixed by what Nussbaum aptly calls our common universal 'sphere of experience'.[64]

Given the typically sparse or non-existent remarks about methods, Ben-Ze'ev should be praised for paying some attention to methodology at the beginning of his book.[65] What he says, however, is not entirely clear. First, he makes a distinction between 'binary' and 'prototypical' categories, a distinction that seems to correspond substantially to that between 'closed' and 'open-textured' concepts as introduced above. Emotions, according to Ben-Ze'ev, constitute *prototypical* categories, inclusion being determined by the degree of similarity to the most typical cases. There is no way to list necessary and sufficient conditions for inclusion, and the borderlines are fuzzy. With this I would more or less agree. But how is the 'best' or 'most typical' example, which determines the inclusion of other examples, then to be found? Ben-Ze'ev claims the prototypical example is one that exhibits

'the significant features of the given emotional category and has but a few distinctive features that are not shared by category members'. Reference to 'the significant features' may here seem to be question-begging, but Ben-Ze'ev goes on to explain that we determine these features *first* by asking people to describe typical cases; *second* by discovering the features through conceptual analysis. The first point is true but rather trivial, given the typical disharmony of people's examples. The second point is more promising but still begs the all-important question: What *kind* of method should we use in our conceptual analyses? There are signs that Ben-Ze'ev is suspicious of a naturalistic solution – witness his disparaging reference to a 'vague discourse about some essence of emotions'.[66] But then I would suggest that he is faced with a dilemma: either the 'prototypical' example yielded by conceptual analysis is prototypical because it best captures the natural point of the concept, in which case the concept itself and not only the particular example should be explicated, or else it is the best example for some other reason, in which case mere reference to 'conceptual analysis' tells us precious little about how the example can be found. This is not meant to undermine the merit of what Ben-Ze'ev or, for that matter, other emotion theorists subsequently say about particular emotions, which is often insightful and to the point. After all, the proof of the pudding generally lies in the eating rather than somewhere in the cooking. However, I believe that it would add substantially to the merits of their dishes, or at least help others to follow suit, if we received more precise information about the cooking process.

Next a few observations about 'basicness'. A distinction between 'basic' or 'primitive' emotions, on the one hand, and 'non-basic' or 'complex' emotions (that is, emotions which are reducible to primitive emotions or to such emotions and some non-emotional factors) on the other, is central to many cognitive theories. As with emotions in general, the problem is that the lists of the basic emotions tend to differ both among philosophers and among psychologists, although one will probably find sadness, anger, and fear on most of them. Some authors, however, simply reject this distinction altogether. Yet others, such as Ben-Ze'ev, try to steer a middle course by retaining the distinction but not letting it play too important a role in their analyses of specific emotions.[67] I must admit that I find the invocation of this distinction, as typically formulated, of dubious usefulness. First of all, diverse and often seemingly conflicting criteria have been invoked for considering some emotions as basic, criteria having to do with priority of development in human beings (qua species and qua individuals), functional value, universality, prevalence, and uniqueness (physiological, expressive, etc.).[68] Exploring these criteria, the psychologists Power and Dalgleish admit that the arguments typically given for each of them are weak; yet they try to extrapolate from research findings exploiting all of these different criteria and end up with a 'core list' of anger, fear, disgust, and sadness.[69]

However, extrapolating from weak premises yields a weak conclusion. It seems reasonable to suppose that pursuing, for instance, the developmental criterion may enlighten us about which emotions are prior in the order of emergence; those would then be 'basic' in a certain temporal sense, but not necessarily in the above ('non-complex') sense of all other emotions being reducible to them. Nevertheless, there are cases when it seems reasonable to understand an emotion as a compound of other emotions. Perhaps we may here again be aided by some philosophical insights from a different field.

Let us consider Elizabeth Anscombe's clever discussion of the 'bruteness' of facts.[70] Saying that my grocer *carts* potatoes to my house and *leaves* them there is more basic or 'brute' than a description of the grocer as having *supplied* me with a quarter of potatoes. The second description is, again, more brute than saying that I *owe* the grocer such-and-such a sum of money, but that description could, in turn, be brute relative to yet another description, say, of my being *solvent*. None of the descriptions is reducible to the preceding one in the order of bruteness; yet each naturally follows from there, given a context of normal procedure not implied by the descriptions themselves but not independently describable either except as the absence of all circumstances which could impair the given description as a description of the relevant action (e.g. carting potatoes to the buyer's house). In this sense, facts are not brute per se; they are only brute relative to descriptions and contexts.

Now, there exists some interesting psychological literature about 'blended' or 'compound' emotions, that is, emotions as compounds of other emotions aroused by various and often conflicting aspects of the same object or situation.[71] 'Compound' must here be understood to refer to a unique combination, not merely to co-existence. If jealousy is cognitively organised as a compound emotion, as I shall argue later (a compound of anger, envy, and righteous indignation), then it does not simply mean that the jealous person is angry, *and* envious, *and* righteously indignant, but that these three emotions are blended together in a unique, characteristic way in the cognitive structure of jealousy. Anscombe's analysis helps us to understand how this can be, without presupposing that anger, envy, and indignation are more basic (non-complex), as such, than jealousy; it may only so happen that they are brute relative to a certain description of a mental state and a certain situation. There could exist other emotions or attitudes relative to which jealousy itself (along with some other emotions or non-emotional elements) were brute – for instance, disgust of Jews. Even more importantly, there could well be situations in which other emotions were brute relative to anger. A proposed hierarchy of basicness in each particular instance thus does not imply any controversial theory about essentially basic/primitive versus complex emotions. What we have, instead, is a much more flexible account of basicness according to which the same emotions can appear under different descriptions at different levels of

basicness, just as the same behaviour (the same set of motions) can appear under different descriptions as an expression of different emotions.

Let us now turn to the components of emotion. Although all cognitive theories naturally enough consider *cognition* the linchpin of an emotion (hence their label), they part company as to the exact nature and status of this basic component. Most common perhaps is a multi-component variety which divides the cognition element into two (*factual belief* and *evaluation*) and adds some other, less central but still necessary, components: *concern, feeling* and (sometimes) *behaviour patterns*.[72] However, we saw in the previous section that there exist versions, such as that of Solomon, which make do with a single cognitive component, *evaluation*, and consider the non-cognitive elements unnecessary. This discordance may be seen as a source of embarrassment for the cognitive theories, or at least give us some cause for concern about their validity. While I shall not be adding any new positive arguments here for the viability of a cognitive approach, I shall try to defuse this 'source of embarrassment' by carving out a middle-ground approach between the multi- and single-component versions, an approach which follows Solomon in positing *evaluation* (that is, evaluative belief) as the single cognitive component, but departs from him in adding *concern* (desire or aversion, see s. 1.2) as the other necessary component of emotion. I argue that the multi- and single-component views are both anchored in certain misconceptions concerning the much discussed fact-value distinction. More specifically, I claim that the multi-component view retains too much of this distinction which should have been omitted, while the single-component view omits too much of it which should have been retained. I think that a cogent line of defence for my claim can be worked out by drawing on two separate sets of arguments, by Elizabeth Anscombe and Philippa Foot, respectively, relating to the nature of moral language.

The distinction between facts and values was long taken for granted in philosophical circles. While it has been waning in popularity there during the last few decades, it still holds its ground pretty well in the social sciences, especially in economics and within some of the prevailing research paradigms in psychology. According to this distinction, only 'facts' are *objective* whereas 'evaluations' (moral, aesthetic, or otherwise) are *subjective* responses to facts. The details of the numerous more-or-less radical subjectivisms based on this distinction are less important here than their common assumption that evaluation always presupposes some purely-descriptive, value-free foundation: i.e. that which is evaluated.

Many proponents of the multi-component view seem to be strongly influenced by this distinction. Ben-Ze'ev's account is a case in point.[73] He divides emotions into four basic components: *cognition* (beliefs, veridical or distorted, about the facts of the given situation), *evaluation* (assessment of the cognition), *motivation* (based on concern), and *feeling*. Thus, when *A* envies *B* for getting better grades, *A* has some information about *B*'s grades,

and evaluates his own inferior position negatively, *and* is concerned about abolishing his inferiority, *and* entertains some negative feelings about the case. Ben-Ze'ev emphasises that the evaluative component is the most important one, in that it distinguishes between emotions. For example, *hope* distinguishes itself from *expectation* in evaluating the relevant future event as somehow favourable. However, he is also at pains to explain that the cognition, which 'contains descriptive information about the object, logically comes prior to the evaluation of this object, namely, to a normative appraisal of its value. Hence, there can be cognition without evaluation'.[74] In other words, to use a recently fashionable jargon, evaluation 'supervenes' upon brute facts.

It is salutary at this point to return to Anscombe's piece, cited earlier in this section. Her point there is not only that the bruteness or basicness of facts is relative to descriptions and contexts, but also that our climb up and down the ladder of bruteness straddles any taken-for-granted distinction between facts and values. Recall Anscombe's examples, where carting potatoes to my house and leaving them there was considered brute relative to supplying me with potatoes, which again was brute to my owing the grocer money, which then was brute relative to my being solvent, and so forth. There is no particular step in this ladder of bruteness where we can say that the factual has ended and the evaluative taken over. Notice that this is much more than a slippery-slope argument about a slide from the 'purely factual' to the 'purely evaluative', for my owing the grocer money (and it thus being *morally* incumbent on me to pay) seems to be no less of a fact than that he left potatoes at my door.

To add further strength to this insight, it is helpful to bring in here reference to J. Kovesi's perspicuous analysis of the nature and formation of moral and non-moral concepts. His conclusion is that their difference does not at all coincide with a difference between evaluation and description. The real difference can rather be seen as lying in the formal elements, the divergent reasons for collocating certain features, aspects and qualities, and for grouping them together. Thus, whereas we always describe from some point of view, we can never be said to do so from a perspective which would be called *the descriptive* point of view. In the case of moral concepts, such as *murder*, we describe from the moral point of view, but that point of view is in no way less descriptive than the perspective employed in classifying an object as a table or a kettle. It is simply *another* perspective; we are drawing attention to features of another sort.[75] Kovesi's considerations help to bring out the nature of the misunderstandings that flourish on the basis of the description-evaluation distinction. Evaluation is not the icing on the cake of hard facts; in the case of evaluative notions we cannot, so to speak, peel away the layers of evaluation until we touch bottom, until we reach the neutral descriptive content. We do not *first* have hard facts and *then* load them with normativity. That is to say, although we have facts such as

another candidate getting a post for which I applied, or my brother receiving more attention from my mother than I, which would, to use Anscombe's terminology, be 'brute relative to' jealousy, there is nothing in the nature of the brute facts themselves that tells us to collocate them under the heading 'jealousy'. There is an independent evaluative rationale behind the concept of jealousy which determines the reactions brought together under that heading. If we remove the rationale, we are not left with the descriptive criteria for jealousy minus evaluation; we are simply left with nothing at all. As Kovesi puts it most forcibly: Evaluative notions 'do not evaluate the world of description but describe the world of evaluation'.[76] All notions are formed for some reason, and they 'describe' from some point of view.

Dividing 'cognition' up into belief and evaluation or, as Ben-Ze'ev does, reserving the term 'cognition' for the descriptive element and loading 'evaluation' on top of it, obscures the way in which the evaluative component in emotion describes the world around us and picks up, for instance in jealousy, those instances of other people's acts vis-à-vis us and a third party which fit into its grid. It is not as if we can, à la Ben-Ze'ev, neatly distinguish between my perception of the facts of such a three-party relationship and my subsequent evaluation of them as morally positive or negative; rather, as I suggested in the preceding paragraph, what is perceived of as fact is informed by the very moral point of view. That point enters into the collocating description of the jealousy-inducing relationship (as one of undeserved disfavouring; see s. 5.1) rather than supervening upon it. For in default of such a point, these facts would never have been brought together under a single description in the first place. In other words, Ben-Ze'ev's division is both redundant and misleading.

Should we then simply embrace a single-component view of emotion where *evaluation* rules the roost? I have already mentioned Solomon as an advocate of such an 'evaluation theory'. However, let us concentrate here on Nussbaum's version, as she has argued for its superiority both more passionately and more recently than Solomon. Nussbaum defines emotions as evaluative judgements 'about important things', that is, things to which great significance for the person's own flourishing can be attached but which are, at the same time, more or less outside his control. Nussbaum emphasises that such judgements are to be seen not merely as *necessary* constituent elements in emotion, but also as *sufficient* ones.[77] But what about cases where the correct evaluative beliefs are in place, but the emotion is not felt – I know that a child has been sexually abused, what a serious effect such abuse can have on the long-term well-being of the child, and how wrong it is to commit such atrocities; what if, however, I am simply not concerned about the interests of this particular child (or children in general) and do not experience any compassion towards it? Nussbaum's answer is that in such cases we need to distinguish between 'really accepting a proposition and simply mouthing the words'. Parroting evaluative sentences does not mean

that I really *believe* them; they need to become part of my cognitive makeup and motivation for action before we can start to talk about real beliefs.[78]

Here Nussbaum has gone as far in the direction away from the fact-value distinction as possible; it is not only that evaluation involves, rather than supervenes upon, description; it also incorporates *motivation*. This is, I believe, throwing out the baby with the bathwater. There remains a valid distinction, not between description and moral evaluation, but rather between morally evaluative description and motivation. This distinction is commonly obscured in moral theory by talk about 'moral' or 'normative' judgements which can cover both; thus the social-science textbook staple about 'normative conclusions only following from normative premises'. If this means that evaluative descriptions can only follow from other such descriptions, Anscombe's example refutes it: The non-evaluative description of how a grocer carries potatoes to my house conversationally implies through a number of steps the evaluative description that it would, *ceteris paribus*, be morally right of me to pay the grocer money. However, it does not follow that I must wish that the grocer be paid or that I actually choose to do so, all things considered. Theorists, whether engaged in emotion theory or pure moral theory, would do well to pay heed to Foot's point that it is one's will, 'something the agent wants or which it is in his interest to have', which turns a moral evaluation into a motivation.[79] An agent can hold true evaluative beliefs about the plight of sexually abused children – beliefs which have really sunk in and are not only superficially parroted – without being stirred at all to compassion and compassionate action, because the motivation element is lacking; a drug baron in Columbia can be correctly informed about the effects of his drugs on their addicts, and about his own moral failings, without having the slightest inclination to mend his ways because he is, as it happens, not concerned about the suffering of others or about the demands of morality. If we deny this, we end up in the cloud-cuckoo land of believing that all moral callousness and wrongdoing must be attributable to ignorance or mental illness, an assumption which (contrary to Socrates and the optimistic nineteenth- and early twentieth-century reformation theories of punishment) simply flies in the face of all experience. The worst evildoers are, indeed, those who have perfect understanding of the moral evaluations in question and decide to act contrary to them. Moral evaluative judgements thus provide at best, as Foot states, a set of *hypothetical imperatives*:[80] if you are concerned about the substantive conditions involved in the evaluation, then you experience the relevant emotion(s) and (perhaps) decide to stir a finger. Hence, I conclude that it is necessary to include the *concern*-component in the specification of emotion. Without it, that is, without desires and aversions, there would be no experienced emotions and no motivations to act upon them. Or as Richard Wollheim puts it: 'That emotion rides into our lives on the back of desire is a crucial fact about emotion, as well as a crucial fact about us.'[81]

What about the third traditional component: *feeling*? It would take me too far away from our present concerns to respond here to those who believe in (episodic) desires without feelings: to behaviourists or those artificial-intelligence theorists who claim that a computer program can, in principle, have the same desire to win a game as the ordinary chess-player. However, at least in the area of emotions, the idea of a frustrated desire without, so to speak, any frustration, seems thoroughly implausible. How 'calm' can one's desire be for it to remain a desire?[82] If no 'botherment' occurs after my car is stolen, how can I still claim, other things being equal, that I had a desire that it should not be stolen, and that I am really angry? I do not think I can. If I am right in this, it means that we do not have to add the feeling element to emotion as an independent (third) necessary component, but rather consider it an implication of the conative component: if my desire is satisfied, I feel content; if it is frustrated, I feel bothered; but the feelings of contentment or botherment can express themselves differently at different times, or in different emotions, or even (physiologically and phenomenologically) identically in otherwise diverse emotions, as we saw in section 1.2. I still want to retain the possibility that the feeling is *unconscious*. This is not tantamount to claiming that there are emotions without the feeling component. When we speak of having been unconsciously jealous of *B*, we do not mean that we were jealous without any feelings; what we mean is rather that we were self-deceived about either (a) our evaluative beliefs concerning *B*, (b) our uncomfortable feelings, or (c) the connection between the two. In a typical case, we undoubtedly felt bad (maybe we suffered from headache or stomach upset) but we did not realise until later where these feelings stemmed from. So the feelings were unconscious qua feelings of jealousy, not qua feelings per se. In this sense, the reference to unconscious feelings need not carry the dubious psychological baggage at which many contemporary writers look askance.

Accepting the redundancy of a value-free 'cognition' and of a logically independent feeling component does not mean that we are yet home and dry as far as the essential components of emotion are concerned. The course of our discussion now brings us to a point where another and perhaps greater difficulty awaits us, for we still need to ask whether the evaluative component necessarily involves a *belief* or not. Recall the short exploration of 'inert' emotions in section 1.2: coming to know that a person did not really, as I previously believed, wrong me does not mean that my anger is automatically terminated.[83] It might still hold me in grip, however irrationally. How can that be if the emotion is really grounded in my evaluative *belief*? Rather than giving up the cognitive component altogether, many thinkers have wanted to cast the notion of *belief* in the role of villain here. What lies at the heart of emotion – so the argument goes – is not a full-bodied belief but rather the experience of 'seeing-as' (recall the Calhoun–Roberts solution): dwelling on or attending to in consciousness, grasping one thing in terms of

another. Hence, instead of beliefs, we should talk about 'construals', 'modes of attention', or 'recognitions': propositional attitudes with an intentional focus which still fall short of strict beliefs.[84] Nancy Sherman even attempts to show that Aristotle had thought of this problem and suggested a solution along the construal-lines,[85] an attempt which seems to me based on a rather strained reading as Aristotle explicitly said that 'imagining' is not sufficient to ground emotion. By merely imagining what is fearful, according to Aristotle, like a person looking at a painting of some dreadful scene, we may become physically aroused, but we do not experience the emotion itself. That only happens after we come to *think* something to be truly fearful or threatening.[86]

If we relax the demand that our emotional evaluations involve beliefs, we evade the conceptual problem of inert emotions suggested above; we are then, when such emotions occur, simply evaluatively *construing* a state of affairs in which we do not *believe*. However, I am afraid that this solution may import as many difficulties as it removes. The problem is that more conceptual freight seems to be heaped on the notion of 'construal' (or its equally contrived sister-notions) than it can bear. Calhoun and Roberts do not want to abandon the condition that the construal has propositional content. It must, in principle, be articulable (linguistically formulable), although it is not articulated. Yet it is not allowed to have the status of a belief, not even of a 'vague' or 'insufficiently articulated' belief. At the same time, the construal is more than an ordinary perception in that it must have (prospective) truth-value. Perhaps we should envisage it as some kind of belief-piece from a jigsaw puzzle which has not yet been arranged. But the snag is that this specification of construal forfeits its similarity to belief in direct proportion as it achieves its relation to perception, and vice versa. It thus becomes an all too easy prey for Ockham's razor: is there really a place for an intermediate mental entity between clear perception and vague belief?

If the reader has the same impression here as I have, that the whole construal-thesis is but a sledgehammer to crack a nut, it is because a much simpler solution seems to suggest itself: does the person still experiencing anger after realising that he was not wronged, or a fear of spiders in spite of knowing that spiders are harmless, not simply engage in *doublethink*, that powerful manoeuvre which Orwell so famously defined in *1984* as holding two contradictory beliefs in one's mind simultaneously? More academically oriented people would probably want to call it *wilful self-deception*: holding 'deep down' or 'high up' with lessened awareness unacknowledged beliefs (about being slighted by the person at whom our anger is directed; about the harmfulness of spiders), beliefs which can still hold us captive for shorter or longer periods, while attending, in direct consciousness, to the contradictory rational and veridical beliefs.[87] The common discrepancy between emotion and belief is then not between emotion and belief per se but rather between emotion and *avowed* belief.

Roberts is unhappy about the self-deception solution, finding it implausible that I can 'either simultaneously or in rapid succession' make contradictory judgements (about spiders, being slighted by another person or not, etc.).[88] His doubts echo those of many philosophers who see something inherently misguided or even strictly illogical about the very notion of self-deception: How can I at the same time be the source and object of deception, the deceiver and the one deceived? And how can I decide to ignore a certain part of my belief-set without having precisely located what I want to ignore, thereby constantly attending to that which I do not want to attend? Self-deception has fallen on hard times in philosophical circles, and that in spite of ingenious suggestions as to how its logical paradox can be solved by assuming that the contradictory beliefs are held at 'different levels' or attended to in 'different respects'.[89] This presents, however, a typical case of academic misgivings being at odds with ordinary intuitions, and in such cases it is not always the latter which must be relinquished.[90]

As Nussbaum notes, it is the most common of truths that we often hold contradictory beliefs, especially in cases involving long habituation – citing her own example of still irrationally believing deep down that the US Supreme Court is in California, owing to a deeply-ingrained childhood misunderstanding, although her sober self knows perfectly well that this belief is false. If this can happen with matters on which nothing depends, such as the location of the court, for the person holding the belief, then it is even more likely to be true with strong evaluative beliefs, often laid down in childhood or in times of affective vulnerability.[91] However, owing to the relative brevity and instability of most (if, obviously, not all) episodic emotions as compared with other propositional attitudes, their grip on us, in cases of self-deception, tends to be relatively short-lived. For instance, while the belief that all blacks are stupid, held by a person who deep down knows better, can hold sway unchallenged for extended periods, the belief that spiders are harmful will typically only induce the emotion of fear in us sporadically, hitting us in unguarded moments.[92] If the emotion lingers on, it will do so at a subordinate level of consciousness while the contrary veridical belief operates and rules at a higher level.

The idea of beliefs lodging deeply enough in us to alter our cognitive lives, while not avowed or directly attended to, is an idea entertained on the grounds of daily experience. Philosophers, who continue to ask in bewilderment how that *can* happen, may here learn a lot from psychologists who are normally more interested in how it *does* happen. While the former tend to be stuck in unrewarding misgivings about the Freudian notion of the unconscious, the latter typically state that 'it is possible to be conscious of one interpretation of an event whilst also holding an unconscious and contradictory interpretation'[93] – and then go on from there. Power and Dalgleish, for instance, propose a plausible psychological model according to which there are two main routes to the generation of emotion: a rational (paradigmatic)

'schematic-appraisal' route, and an associatively driven 'automatic' route, where a rational, non-self-deceptive level of meaning is 'short-circuited' owing to some personal inhibitions.[94] Admittedly, this model is a little more advanced than the simple generalisations of dinner-table talk about irrational emotions and self-deception, but the upshot is more or less the same in accounting for contradictory beliefs. It is tempting to conclude that the invocation of *construals* is but a distraction in the discussion of the ingenious tactics employed by our mind to preserve and manipulate entrenched evaluations and inure them against conflicting evidence. We do not need to give up the view of evaluation as grounded in the much less conceptually cumbersome notion of *belief* to make sense of those tactics.

It might be argued at this point, however, that I have only traded one loathsome thing for another. Although the construal-solution is even less capable than the belief one of accounting for emotional inertia, it does not mean that the latter is satisfactory. Perhaps – in order to make full sense of our emotional landscape – we must abandon even more drastically than the construal-theorists dream of the condition that the cognitive component of emotion is linguistically formulable. Perhaps it need not have any propositional content at all. This is the point of John Deigh's attack on cognitive theories of emotion, the most serious and full-blooded one mounted in recent years.[95] Deigh does not reject the insights of cognitivism altogether; for instance, he readily admits that emotions are intentional, and thus distinguishable from mere feelings. What he opposes, however, is the 'intellectual sabotage' of cognitivism which has gradually taken place during the last decades. He suggests a return to an older form of cognitivism, represented in works produced during the early part of the century by English psychologists and philosophers. There, 'cognition' referred to any mental state in which the subject was cognisant of some object (including the states of perceiving, imagining, or remembering). Nothing in this 'traditional' understanding implied that the cognition must have propositional content: that the person affirm or even consider any *proposition* whatsoever. In other words, something can count as an intentional object without the subject entertaining any beliefs about it, however vague, or being in the grip of a linguistically formulable (if as yet unformulated) 'construal': 'When a baby or a cat stares at you, you are the object of its stare. Yet it does not follow that the baby or the cat has any beliefs about you. When a dog relishes a bone, the bone is the object of its delight. Yet it does not follow that the dog has any beliefs about the bone.'[96]

Robin Dillon has recently used Deigh's insights to reformulate the cognitive-theory explanation of how successful women entertaining true beliefs about their self-worth can still suffer from irrational bouts of shame and resentment. The reason for these anomalous emotions, Dillon argues, is not, in all likelihood, that there are other irrational beliefs or even construals operating somewhere within these women – at least not in cases where we

have no independent rationale to posit the beliefs' existence except as an explanatory tool to make sense of the emotional incongruity. Rather, she says, we need to distinguish between two modes of understanding, 'intellectual understanding' and 'experiential understanding', where the latter involves experiencing something directly and feeling the truth of what is experienced without involving any actual beliefs or judgements, that is to say, without any thought expressed or expressible in propositional representations which have a truth-value. These women can then be considered to both understand (intellectually) and not understand (experientially) their worth at the same time.[97]

The main objection that I want to raise to this 'back-to-basics' version of cognitivism is that it fails to exclude the possibility that emotions can be ascribed to infants and animals. Now this may seem to be a rather obtuse objection, perhaps even defiantly so. The main spur of Deigh's writing is specifically to counter the cognitivist 'inattention to the emotions of beasts and babies',[98] along with the intellectualisation of those primitive emotions of fear, anger, love, sexual passion, and sorrow which we have in common with the animals and are, for Deigh, essentially unresponsive to reason. To argue my case, let me first point out that emotion-terms such as 'fear' are not always used to refer to emotions. A person in an objectless state of anxiety is often said to be suffering from 'fear'. A person caught with an eerie feeling of discomfort upon entering premises remotely similar to the site of an earlier horrifying experience may be described as being in a 'state of fear'. A person suddenly looking down from a precipice may be 'scared as hell'. However, there are more reasonable ways of accounting for these states of experience than referring to them as the emotion of fear: the first person is the grip of a *mood*, that 'metaphysical generalization' of an emotion (see s. 1.2); the second experiences a *conditioned reflex*; the third has a *startle-response*.[99]

These distinctions are not arbitrary; they help to mark out psychologically and morally important aspects of human experiences which distinguish them from real emotions. By this I am not saying that emotions cannot be constituted by, among other things, automatic responses. Such responses were, for instance, plausibly invoked by Power and Dalgleish, as mentioned above, to account for irrational emotions. However, automatic responses of that kind need to be distinguished from objectless moods, and from pre-linguistic biological responses/reflexes which do not involve any beliefs, not even self-deceptive ones. That distinction is acknowledged in everyday speech; when pressed, most people would be willing to grant that, while often referred to as 'fear', the three kinds of experiences described at the end of the last paragraph are conceptually distinguishable – for example, from one's rational fear of street muggers and even from a typical sporadically appearing irrational fear of spiders. Furthermore, this distinction is helpful when coming to terms with alleged infant emotions. For instance, there was

a time when my son reacted anxiously toward patches of light on the wall above his bed, caused by a sudden reflection from moving curtains. I think there is every reason to keep those experiences distinct from the fear he expressed later, after acquiring language, of these patches as 'animals biting people'. Of course, there may have been an intermediate period, around the time when he was learning to speak, when his 'fearful behaviour' was difficult to categorise as either indicating a startle-response or a fear, but that does not change the fact that there is a valid distinction to be drawn between the two. My complaint about Deigh's 'traditional' cognitivism is that it obliterates such distinctions and makes the notion of fear become bloated beyond good sense: an error from which the more mainstream varieties of cognitivism escape by leaning, like Hope on her anchor, on *belief* as the cognitive component of emotion.

Strangely enough, claiming that animals do not experience emotions (as distinct from moods and automatic responses) is likely to arouse even greater fury in people holding the opposite view than a similar claim about infants. Even as sober a thinker as Ben-Ze'ev states defiantly that any claim about animals' lack of emotion is 'refuted by ethological research as well as by common sense observations (at least by those who have animals around them)'.[100] As a matter of fact, I often used to have animals around me as a child, being a frequent visitor on my aunt's farm, where I even, officially, owned a sagacious old dog. This dog was so 'wise' that when a new puppy appeared on the farm who disturbed his midday siestas and arrested attention at the old dog's expense, he took the puppy in his mouth, walked with it a considerable distance (even swimming across a river) and left it there. This became a repeated ritual, happily explained by my aunt as an example of the old dog's *jealousy*: he 'resented' the 'undeserved' attention the puppy received, and 'knowing' that the further away from the farm he took it, the 'less likely' the puppy would be to find its way back home, he 'decided' to embark on this long journey. Not only do I now think that my old dog lacked the intellectual repertoire to perform any of the complex logical and statistical manoeuvres posited by my aunt, I do not see the need to ascribe to him any emotion either. He was not jealous but rather, I believe, biologically driven to distance himself from a negative stimulus as much as possible or, more accurately, to distance the stimulus as much as possible from himself.

Perhaps dogs do have beliefs; that is basically an empirical issue. However, given what we know at present, my dog's behaviour admits of a much simpler and theoretically less cumbersome explanation than that given by my aunt. People's reluctance to use Ockham's razor in making sense of animal behaviour can be accounted for in many ways. One reason is the well-known attraction of the *pathetic fallacy*; another (and quite an opposite one at that) is the temptation to assimilate some of our own 'negative' emotions symbolically to alleged animal emotions in order to explain the

former away as 'brutish' or 'bestial'.[101] In any case, I agree with the psychologist J. R. Averill that our understanding of the *nature* of a specific emotion – be it fear, anger, or the arguably more complex pride or jealousy – as distinct from the *evolutionary story* behind it (see ch. 7), is not enhanced much by studying superficially analogous behaviour in animals.[102]

1.4 Preliminary remarks on responsibility, moral justification, and the 'negative' emotions

After having descended temporarily to some of the specifics of the ongoing debate within cognitivism, where, as always, close cousins make the worst enemies, it is now time to ascend again to a more general perspective of our field. Since my aim is to evaluate morally and defend certain kinds of emotions, it is in order to say something first about the connection between moral evaluation and responsibility.

Generally speaking, we can only be held morally responsible for that which is within our voluntary control. If I break the glass door of a jewellery store in order to burgle it, I can be held responsible for my action since it is presumably the result of my deliberation and choice: I have *decided* to commit this offence. However, if my body is blown through the glass door in a hurricane, I am free of responsibility because that unfortunate result is not one over which I have any voluntary control. At most, I could be held responsible for deciding to seek shelter in front of a glass door in a hurricane, rather than in some other equally convenient place nearby, when I should have known that this might well cause an accident.

It should be noted here, if only as an aside, that the fact that an outcome is under our voluntary control, while *necessary* for moral responsibility, is not *sufficient* for it. The fact that it is within my voluntary control to tie the loose shoe laces of all the children in my neighbourhood, by devoting my attention to that and nothing else, does not make me morally responsible for every local accident resulting from loose laces, for there is simply no good reason (moral, statistical, or otherwise) why I should be expected to make such a project my sole preoccupation. Ascribing moral responsibility thus involves considerations of *reasonable expectations*. Even when I am immediately *causally* responsible for an outcome, it does not necessarily follow that I am *morally* responsible for it: I am not morally responsible for your being late for work simply in virtue of the fact that my driving in front of you at a reasonable speed prevented you from speeding and getting to work in time.[103] In the following, whenever I mention 'responsibility', it should be taken to mean 'moral' rather than 'causal' responsibility. However, as any interesting human relationships involving pride and jealousy – the emotions primarily under scrutiny in the present work – are bound to be more intimate and direct than those between me and unknown children with loose shoe laces, or between me and you where I coinciden-

tally disturb your preferred rhythm of driving to work, the caveats mentioned in this paragraph about disharmony between voluntary control and moral responsibility may well be of limited relevance for what follows.

An objection frequently levelled at cognitive theories of emotion is this: by pointing to a cognitive element as the alpha and omega of emotions, you have placed them within the purview of responsibility. If emotions really are rational and purposive rather than irrational and disruptive, then they are very much like actions, and you will have to hold that we choose an emotion much as we choose a course of action. However, this flies in the face of the accumulated experience of mankind. Simply look at our literature which is filled with tales of people who are *captives* of their emotions: 'struck' by jealousy, 'paralysed' by guilt, 'plagued' by remorse, 'felled' by shame, 'blinded' by passion (witness the notorious *crime passionel*), and so forth.[104] Could anyone but the most naive rationalist claim that all these locutions are but convenient feel-good excuses for reactions which are in fact within our voluntary control? Indeed not, the objector would say: emotions are occurrences that happen to us; they bring to the surface that part of our animal-physical nature which often jars with our rational-intellectual life; they are like natural secretions from within, invading our freedom. Maybe one can be held responsible for failing to comport oneself with dignity – putting up an appearance of nonchalance – even if one's soul is burning with the vapours from those natural secretions. But one can surely not be held responsible for failing to turn off the secretions themselves, any more than one can be held responsible for not stopping the production of saliva in one's mouth. Whether or not it should be spat out or swallowed is another story.

No doubt a lingering sense of dissatisfaction with cognitive theories of emotions will remain until this objection has been rebutted. A possible first recourse might be to grant that while emotions qua *dispositions* are outside our voluntary control, and hence beyond the bounds of responsibility, each particular *occurrence* of an emotion is not. The parallel there could be alcoholism. A reasonable view of alcoholism would hold that while the alcoholic's desire for liquor is *uncontrollable* in the sense that he cannot stop having the desire, it is *controllable* in another sense: the alcoholic may use his will-power to refrain from acting on this desire. He decides not to drink, however unquenchable the underlying desire is.

Unfortunately, this parallel does not work in the case of emotions. A person with a strong tendency to jealousy does not decide in each particular case whether to be jealous or not. Given a certain context, he becomes jealous. Likewise, the phlegmatic laggard does not decide to become angry, even if he should be, if he does not have in him the disposition to react angrily when seriously wronged. In other words, emotions seem to differ from ordinary actions in that they do not allow for the same kind of discrepancy between disposition and occurrence, for instance refraining from *x*, as

a result of deliberation in the particular case, when you have a strong tendency to x. When locating responsibility for emotions, our focus must thus be on dispositions rather than on particular occurrences. Justin Oakley reaches a similar conclusion, though from a different angle, when he argues that not only in the case of emotions, but also of many physical acts, the ability to stop something here and now is not a necessary condition for assigning responsibility. We need also to consider how the person came to be in the position where his doing, or having, this 'something' is now unavoidable. Oakley's example is that although I cannot stop myself from driving off a cliff due to the failure of my car's brakes, I can still be held responsible for driving off the cliff if I have carelessly failed to have the brakes checked. The resulting view is that 'we are responsible for something only if we could have at some time avoided doing or having it'. So even if it is true that we cannot cut off our emotions at will once we have them, it may be that we could have taken various measures *earlier* to control their onset.[105]

The crucial question then becomes how and/or to what extent can we generally be held responsible for our personalities, for the formation of our own dispositions and character traits? To answer that question, we need to enter a field much broader than that of emotion theory, a field which has to do with fundamental questions of (moral) upbringing and (moral) education. Aristotle is particularly enlightening on these points, but since it would be getting ahead of my argument to introduce his insights here, let me shelve the details of his discussion until section 6.1 – simply presupposing in the meantime, for argument's sake, that we may well be, and in fact are, morally responsible for various emotions although their appearance at the present time is not under our direct control.

We should at this point, however, pause to ask whether we may have been mistaken in viewing the possible lack of responsibility for our emotions as a threat to the book's objectives of morally justifying emotions. My underlying assumption here is a widely held and powerful one in moral philosophy: that moral evaluations can only be properly directed at that for which we can be held responsible. R. M. Adams argues in a paper defiantly entitled 'Involuntary Sins' that this common assumption is misconceived.[106] Vices are vices and virtues are virtues, however they have been come by. Similarly, an emotional condition, such as invidious envy, to which opprobrium is typically attached, will, in Adams's view be a proper object of censure in its own right, even if it is an involuntary state of mind. We should bear in mind that blameworthiness does not imply the necessary open expression of blame.[107] There might be overriding (utilitarian) reasons for remaining silent: every parent knows that even after a child becomes responsible for its actions, it would be counter-productive to scold it for every misdeed. This reservation, however, in no way detracts from the seriousness of Adams's challenge to the received wisdom about the relationship between responsibility and blameworthiness.

Adams considers the beliefs of an officer bred up from childhood in the Hitler-*Jugend*, and accepts that such brainwashing could debar the person from forming autonomous beliefs and passing reflective judgements. Still, according to Adams, his beliefs would be evil and make him a fitting object of reproach. How he acquired them would not warrant exemption from blame. If this is so, we do not need to consider people's personal histories before assigning blame or credit to them for their emotions. It does not matter whether we have any chance of changing our existent emotions, or whether we could have brought it about earlier that our underlying emotional dispositions were any different from what they happen to be. If the emotion is of a vicious nature, then we are blameworthy for having it; if it is of a virtuous kind, then having it counts as a moral credit. Adams anticipates an obvious objection: that attitudes, such as those of the Hitler-*Jugend* officer, can be appropriate objects of other moral attitudes, although not of *praise* or *blame*. We can, in other words, 'think poorly' of the person for having such attitudes, pity him or even look down on him, but we cannot blame the person, for his emotions and beliefs are not voluntary. However, Adams rejects this distinction, insisting that heinous attitudes are blameworthy as such.

Now, it is true that we sometimes do blame or praise things without ascribing responsibility to them. For instance, I might blame my broken-down car for my being late for work (and that is not necessarily short for blaming the car mechanic who last fixed it, or the person who sold it to me). Or I might praise my new computer which makes the word processing of this book so much easier than it would otherwise have been. In this sense 'blaming' simply means 'giving the reason for a misfortune or why something does not work', and 'praising' the opposite. However, as part of our language game featuring emotions and attitudes, 'blame' is rarely used in this way. When I *blame* my wife's anger yesterday for my sadness and disappointment today, I am typically giving more than a functional explanation of my present state of mind; I am making a moral claim, expressing a grievance. To be sure, if my friend were killed by a robot, I might *blame* the robot for his death in the same sense as I blamed the car for my being late to work. But if I were concentrating on the robot's motives for its deed, it would be most outlandish to say that I 'blamed' the robot for its undeserved 'anger' at my friend, which led to his killing. Even granting that it makes some sense to talk of a robot being angry (and I am not sure it does), any possible blame of this kind would be ascribed to the person who programmed the robot. Moral blame for emotions requires responsibility, which again presupposes voluntary control. What Adams trades on seems to be little more than the fact that blaming has other roles to play in (perhaps) equally interesting contexts. However, what he says about its role in the 'game' in which we are interested here remains unconvincing.

Still, we should not be too carried away by this counter-argument, for

Oakley suggests some much more initially plausible reasons to be sceptical of the assumption that moral evaluations require responsibility. He does not, like Adams, attack the unlikely targets of fixing praise and blame, but claims instead that there are other significant moral evaluations which can be legitimately applied to us in the absence of responsibility, for instance to those emotions of ours which we are not responsible for having.[108] He calls these evaluations moral assessments of *estimability* and *disestimability*. They distinguish themselves, among other things, from evaluations of blame- or praiseworthiness in being directed at features of the persons themselves, rather than at the situations in which these persons find themselves and the actions they perform there. Thus, esteem or disesteem can be fixed on us because of our beauty or ugliness, intelligence or lack of intelligence, riches or poverty, and in the case of emotions, to our compassion even if/when this is a purely natural sentiment, or to our malice even if/when its onset is completely outside our control (now or earlier). Nevertheless, these evaluations are morally significant in that they can be relevant to the general estimation of a person's moral character, and hence they undermine the traditional 'evaluation-requires-responsibility' assumption.

Far be it from me to argue against Oakley that esteem and disesteem are not morally significant attitudes. However, I think he may underestimate the way in which we commonly assume, when passing judgements of the kind he mentions, that the persons so judged have played some part, however small, in the creation or non-suppression of the (dis)estimable condition. For instance, we may feel that an ugly person could have done a little bit more to look presentable, or that, while of a compassionate constitution, the amount or kind expressed in a particular case goes beyond the person's natural tendency. Beyond this, I would also say that Oakley seems to overstate the common assumption that he attacks in order to provide a focus for his own thesis. The idea behind saying that moral evaluation requires responsibility has, I think, never been that assessments of outcomes for which a particular agent is not morally responsible cannot be morally *significant*. To return to Adams's example of the Hitler-*Jugend* officer, an expression of disesteem of his character can be morally significant in various ways. It can set a moral example to others by providing evidence for what happens when young souls are inculcated with evil; it can give a morally significant instrumental explanation for the plight of my life as marred since I got into his hands (just as explaining why I feel psychologically and morally debilitated after being struck by a serious illness can give a morally significant reason for my present state without ascribing moral responsibility to the disease), and, additionally, it can be read as an indirect imputation of blame on those who brainwashed the officer. In other words, various kinds of moral evaluations of a person's character or behaviour (call them esteem and disesteem if you like) are possible without presupposing moral responsibility. It should be noted, however, that *(a)* they are not moral evaluations of the person qua

agent, and *(b)* they do presuppose a world in which there are other responsible agents, to whom blame can be ascribed, who can learn from example, etc. An evaluation of the Hitler-*Jugend* officer qua agent must be one of *aesthetic*, rather than *moral*, significance, and in a world where no one could be held responsible for anything, all evaluations would be reduced to the aesthetic kind. Thus, I claim (*pace* Oakley) that the moral evaluation of a particular emotion, in so far as the evaluation relates to the person having the emotion as a moral agent, cannot be more than an appendage to the assumption of responsibility for our character traits, for being the kind of persons we are.

As a final comment here, let me anticipate the response of a reader who has taken in my earlier message (s. 1.1) about being guided, *inter alia*, by Aristotle. 'Does not Aristotle's moral code', the reader might ask, 'essentially presuppose what you deny, namely, that moral evaluations of persons, their actions and emotions, often rely heavily on circumstance: conditions completely beyond the persons' control?'[109] It would take me too far afield to give a satisfactory answer to that question here; let me simply say for the moment that this may be an oversimplification of Aristotle's view, and even if it was his view, there are other ways of getting to the conclusions that he intended (see s. 4.2) without scrapping the 'evaluation-requires-responsibility' assumption as I have interpreted it above.

The importance of responsibility notwithstanding, knowing that an emotion falls within the province of the agent's responsibility is only the first step in morally evaluating it as worthy of praise or blame. In general, we can say that an emotion is morally justifiable 'if and only if the evoking object or situation *warrants* the emotion'.[110] Given the pervasiveness and salience of the emotions as sources of moral evaluation ('He is a *jealous* bastard'!) and motivation ('She acted out of *sympathy*'), testing the justifiability of emotions according to this criterion is a constant challenge. It is no coincidence how many of the traditional Christian virtues and vices bear the names of emotions: pride, envy, and anger (as deadly sins), and hope (as a theological virtue), to name but a few. De Sousa hardly exaggerates when he says that 'most of what is morally interesting about human life is played out in the domain of the emotions'.[111] Indeed, if we consider the everyday judgements passed about other people at the dinner table or while doing the washing-up, many of these will, I think, be found to relate to how other people reacted emotionally to us during the day in morally appropriate or inappropriate ways. In academic discussions about morality, emotions may not be as predominant as in kitchen-talk, but they still chart a considerable part of the terrain of ethical inquiry.

How, then, do we perform the test of moral justifiability: when does the 'evoking object or situation' justify an emotion? What we need to do is to follow a twofold procedure: first we must ascertain whether the emotion is *rationally formed*, and then, whether it is *morally fitting* in the given

circumstances. If the emotion passes both these sub-tests, then we can conclude that it is *morally justifiable*. Let me explain this in more detail.

Irrational emotions must first be distinguished from illogical ones. I have already mentioned an example of an apparently *illogical* emotion, that of feeling remorse with regard to a future act which we find morally praise-worthy.[112] If someone claimed to be experiencing such an emotion, we would reject the claim on the grounds that illogical emotions cannot exist any more than widows who have not lost their husbands. The person perhaps misunderstands the term 'remorse', or is playing with words like an artist trying to disturb our traditional modes of thinking, or has identified a feeling similar to one sensed earlier when experiencing remorse (in which case we could point out that feelings do not uniquely distinguish particular emotions), or is perhaps even suffering from hallucinations. *Irrational* emotions, however, typically involve disregard for facts, negligent and hasty judgements, or purposeful self-deceptions: a jealous husband immediately draws the conclusion that his wife has been cheating on him when she returns late from work, although he could easily have verified her story about her car breaking down, and how it was fixed at the garage. Those inert emotions, discussed in the preceding section, which remain in place even after the facts undermining them have revealed themselves, also typically fall into the category of irrationally formed emotions. Admittedly, the dividing line between irrationality and illogicality of emotions may seem fuzzy at times: after the bill from the garage arrives in the mail, is it illogical or 'merely' irrational of the husband to be eaten up by jealousy because of his wife's alleged misconduct on the day she came back late? In that case, I would say 'irrational' because the reason for his jealousy is still not beyond the bounds of logic although it is based on culpable disregard for facts. However, if the same person claimed to be proud of an act which he viewed as despicable (and the reason could not be given that 'deep down' he viewed it somehow otherwise), then we could safely say that the emotion was illog-ical. For, irrespective of all contingent facts, such an emotion would simply not make sense.

After we have ascertained that an emotion is rationally formed in the rele-vant case, we need, secondly, to check whether it is morally fitting, that is, whether it is morally appropriate given the details of the situation, neither too strong nor too weak, nor overriding other more urgent concerns. For instance, anger towards a person, *B*, who has wronged you, may be fully rational, but if it overshadows your feelings of sympathy for *B* in a situation where *B* has tragically lost a spouse and needs your comfort, your anger is not a morally fitting response. Or to take another example, your anger (although rational) may be too excessive in circumstances where the wrong-doing was slight and a more moderate emotion was called for. It is important, as D'Arms and Jacobson have pointed out, to avoid a 'moralistic fallacy' here – namely, the fallacy to infer, from the claim that it would be

morally unfitting to feel an emotion, that it is therefore irrational. The moral wrongness of feeling an emotion never, in itself, constitutes a reason that the emotion is irrational.[113] Incidentally, an emotion can also happen to be morally appropriate to the situation although it is irrationally formed:[114] maybe the man's wife in the aforementioned jealousy example really did cheat on him on the day her car broke down, but as the reasons for her husband's jealousy were unwarranted, his jealousy still counts as morally unjustifiable. It is, thus, not enough for an emotion to be morally fitting *by chance* for it to count as morally justifiable.

Let me make this twofold test clearer with a diagram:

	EMOTION	
	Rationally formed	*Irrationally formed*
Morally fitting	Morally justifiable	Morally unjustifiable
Morally unfitting	Morally unjustifiable	Morally unjustifiable

(left axis label: EMOTION)

Clear as I hope this schema is, a few comments and clarifications are required. It might be tempting for those evaluation theorists who define emotion without any recourse to concern (see s. 1.3) to speak about our emotions being *true* or *false* instead of, or at least in addition to, their being morally justifiable or unjustifiable. An emotion is then simply 'true' if it correctly describes the given situation from a moral point of view, 'false' if it misdescribes it. However, there are two reasons why I consider it wise to resist this temptation: first, because it ignores the way in which the emotion is formed (we want our beliefs to have come about in the right way for them to be justifiable), and second, because I think it necessary, as already argued, to retain *concern* as an independent component, thus leaving it an open question as to whether an emotion is morally fitting even if it correctly records the moral description of a situation: 'Yes, your anger because your car was stolen is *true* in the sense that it is wrong to steal, but should you be so concerned about it in this particular instance – where other emotions seem to be more urgently called for – that your anger can be considered morally justifiable?' The reasonableness of asking questions such as this casts doubt on the value of speaking about emotions as true or false, even for theoretical purposes.[115] It is probably no coincidence that they are hardly, if ever, referred to in such a way in ordinary language either.

A special problem of classification relates to those emotions which rest on non-culpable ignorance: where the subject simply could not know better. My best friend, who has never lied to me before and in whom I have

complete confidence, tells me that the job for which I applied has been given to a less-qualified applicant who happened to be the boss's nephew. I become jealous, but it turns out that my friend lied to me, and it is still undecided who gets the job. Was my jealousy morally justifiable until I realised that my friend had lied (given, of course, that jealousy can be morally fitting, as I shall argue later)? It seems harsh to say that the jealousy was morally unjustifiable because it was irrationally formed: there was simply no good reason for me to question my friend's words, so how could it have been formed more rationally? It may, on the other hand, also seem counter-intuitive to claim that a person was justifiably jealous because of something which in fact did not happen. However, as we are concerned here with justification in a moral sense, I consider this second way of speaking an innocuous one: we can hardly demand more of a person's moral views than that they are *warranted* – even if they fail in the end to be true and to constitute real *knowledge*.

To complicate matters further, even if our emotion is rationally formed and morally fitting, it does not mean that the way we act in response to the emotion will necessarily be rational. I might respond to a sudden burst of anger towards my wife by beating my son (which is surely irrational), or I could take a photo of her from my desk and tear it to pieces. There are divided opinions as to whether the second reaction is *irrational* or merely *arational*; Rosalind Hursthouse, who opts for the latter, correctly points out that there seems to be something both rational and irrational about taking out our anger on the photo of the person who angered us.[116] Moreover, it is always an open question as to whether or not an emotion should be acted upon at all.

An attentive reader will have noted that I asked a question about the moral blame- or praiseworthiness of emotions but couched my answer in terms of moral (un)justifiability. Do the extensions of these terms necessarily coincide? Well, as a general rule in the moral sphere, I think that they do. People are blameworthy for performing morally unjustifiable actions or entertaining morally unjustifiable emotions, and so forth. However, there are some subtle points to be observed here. Some morally unjustifiable emotions may be so trivial that it would seem odd to say that a person is blameworthy for having them (and by that I mean more than that he should not be openly blamed for them, which is another matter). Consider, for instance, a teenage boy who is a little bit more angry than he perhaps should be because the girl he fancies stood him up on a date. While it may seem a bit excessive to speak of a 'blameworthy' emotion there, it still remains that we should aim at as morally perfect a fit as possible between the intensity of our emotions and the situations in which they arise. In that sense, any deviation, however small, is blameworthy.

Another question arises in cases where emotions come about in irrational ways through hastily formed judgements. There might be a case for arguing

that we cannot survive in life without forming such judgements now and then; rationally turning every stone to double-check facts would simply take up too much of our time. Indeed, many prejudices, especially in young people, are of this kind: they are not the entrenched, purposeful, and self-deceptive half-truths or truths-and-halves that every moralist will condemn, but rather judgements which people quickly form to get on with things and are ready to discard later when they have more time to consider details. Should emotions that come about in this way still be deemed irrationally formed and thus morally unjustifiable? One reason to say no might be the *didactic* value of hasty prejudices. Every teacher knows how much easier it is to arouse students' interest in – and ultimately to guide them to true opinions on – issues about which they already have formed some judgements, however hasty. I would much rather discuss the moral inappropriateness of *disgust* towards people of other races with a student who had already felt such disgust, for instance, upon sitting next to a coloured person in a bus, than with one who had no interest whatsoever in racial issues and who may never even have come into close contact with a person from another racial group. However, in the end, neither of these two reasons (the necessity of forming hasty judgements, or the didactic value of having some beliefs to work on rather than none) suffices to show that an emotion formed irrationally because of haste is not blameworthy. These certainly point to mitigating circumstances, where, for instance, expression of blame might be out of place, but they do not carry enough weight to undermine the demand which we must ideally make of every moral person, that his moral beliefs, including his emotion beliefs, are both rationally formed and morally fitting.

Let us now enter the forbidden ground of the 'negative' emotions. The first question to ask is then, of course: what is a 'negative' emotion? While reference to such emotions is a common feature of ordinary speech, not much scholarly work has been done to demarcate systematically their (alleged) negativity: what exactly is it that these emotions have in common which justifies their condemnation? Ben-Ze'ev provides a notable exception, however, for he spends considerable time exploring the characteristics of 'negative' emotions and what sets them apart from the 'positive' ones. 'Essentially', Ben-Ze'ev remarks, 'positive emotions incorporate a positive evaluation, pleasant feelings, and the desire to maintain the situation; negative emotions incorporate a negative evaluation, unpleasant feelings and the desire to change the situation.'[117] For example, love is according to Ben-Ze'ev's analysis, 'basically a positive emotion', meaning that 'the positive evaluation and its associated positive motivational component and pleasant feelings are more essential in love than are the negative elements'. So even for emotions as complex as love, 'we can nevertheless characterise their typical cases as either positive or negative'.[118]

Ben-Ze'ev's characterisations are coherent and consistently followed in his analyses of different emotions. They are thus theoretically useful, at least

for his own line of inquiry. The snag is that these characterisations have arguably little to do with the way in which the terms 'negative' and 'positive' emotion are used in everyday language. For instance, in Ben-Ze'ev's analysis, compassion and sympathy (traditionally praised as positive and virtuous) become 'negative' emotions, while *Schadenfreude* and pride (the former universally condemned and the latter commonly viewed askance) become 'positive'. Now, there may be good reasons (see s. 1.3) to depart from ordinary language: sometimes deeply embedded distinctions in ordinary language turn out to be useless; alternatively, there may be good arguments for invoking new distinctions which cut across ordinary usage. However, Ben-Ze'ev does not provide any such arguments even though he is, naturally, well aware of the irrelevance of his characterisations to the common moral connotations of the terms in question.[119] One might be tempted to ask, at first glance, why Ben-Ze'ev did not simply construe the distinction he singles out as one between 'painful' and 'pleasant' emotions. To that he could retort that his 'positive' emotions can sometimes be painful (as love frequently is), and his 'negative' emotions (such as anger) can sometimes be pleasant. Furthermore, as the essential feature which picks out the nature of a specific emotion is, for Ben-Ze'ev, an evaluative one and not a feeling component (see s. 1.3), it is preferable for him to classify emotions in light of the former rather than the latter. But then I think that his purpose would have been best served by coining new but transparent terms such as 'positively evaluating' versus 'negatively evaluating' emotions (which must, however, not be confused with 'positively evaluated' and 'negatively evaluated', see below).

If we want to reserve the labels 'positive' and 'negative' for an understanding of the emotions that is more in line with ordinary usage, the question arises what precisely this usage amounts to. It has undoubtedly, I think, a moral dimension. When Calhoun and Solomon discuss the possible meanings of the labels 'positive' and 'negative' in this respect, their first suggestion is, thus: that these refer to morally 'benign' versus 'hostile' emotions.[120] Some standard psychological studies of 'negative' emotions rely on a similar understanding of 'negativity'.[121] Is an emotion then perhaps labelled 'negative' if, and only if, it is morally unjustifiable, in which case the extensions of 'negativity' and 'moral unjustifiability' (as explained above) of the emotions would fully coincide? Not really, for then there must be cases where even the most 'positive' emotion, according to common opinion, such as compassion, would count as negative, that is, cases where it is, for instance, felt out of proportion. However, even in such cases of excessive compassion, the emotion itself would not normally be labelled 'negative'. The reason is that in ordinary language the terms 'negative' and 'positive' emotion are not used to refer to particular (and perhaps untypical) instances of an emotion but rather to emotions as a whole. I think it is fair to say that according to this understanding, a 'negative' emotion is one which in all cases (or, at best, in all but the most exceptional cases) is thought to be

morally bad; a 'positive' emotion is one which in all (or almost all) cases is deemed morally good. The typical ordinary-language list of 'negative' emotions would then include *Schadenfreude*, anger, pride(fulness), envy, and jealousy, among others, whereas compassion, sympathy, love, considerateness, 'happy-for', etc., would be counted as 'positive'.

I see no particular reason to depart from this received, if somewhat imprecise and non-technical, understanding of the terms 'negative' and 'positive' emotion. (Surely, owing to the context-dependence of moral appraisals, many emotions are difficult to specify as 'essentially good' or 'essentially bad', and thus belong on neither list.) However, given this understanding, what I shall argue is that people are often mistaken about which emotions fall into which category. More specifically, I argue that pride(fulness) and jealousy do not deserve their places on the list of negative emotions. In the following, whenever I use the terms 'positive' and 'negative' emotion in quotation marks, I am referring to the ordinary-language understanding of the respective terms and to the emotions which are *typically* placed in each category. When they appear without quotation marks, however, I am referring to the ordinary understanding of the terms and the emotions which should *properly* be placed there.

In recent years, we have seen a number of studies suggesting that particular 'negative' emotions, such as pride and jealousy, have some redeeming features: that they are not as black as they have been painted, do not deserve their 'unqualified opprobrium', etc.[122] Some more general defences of the class of 'negative' emotions have also appeared, but these have been equally cautious and reserved. One of two approaches is then usually taken. One is to argue that while in principle negative, the 'negative' emotions can have some *instrumental value* in bringing about positive moral consequences in particular cases. However, this instrumental value is seen as somehow marginal and inessential.[123] The other is to emphasise the *contrast value* of the negative emotions: they offer a kind of testimonial or guarantee of authenticity to the 'positive' emotions and virtues by making the latter stand out in sharp relief to the former.[124] A certain 'negative' emotion such as anger can then even be a necessary condition for the existence of a basic virtue such as forgiveness. This second tack bears strong resemblance to a common solution to the theological *problem of evil* (why an almighty, all-benevolent God allows so much turpitude and suffering in the world): without all the badness – so the story goes – we would never learn to appreciate the good.[125] What both these approaches have in common is the presupposition that while we would, in principle, be better off without the 'negative' emotions, there are some factual or conceptual considerations which force us to accept them, however reluctantly and conditionally.

A less guarded defence is suggested by Michael Stocker's justification of the 'painful' emotions. While predominantly concerned with such painful (but non-'negative') emotions as regret and grief, much of what Stocker says

seems, *mutatis mutandis*, applicable to the 'negative' emotions. He speaks about the ideal of wholly positive emotions as a 'fantasy-ideal'. A life where we could only experience those 'might well not be a life at all' and 'most certainly […] not […] anything even approaching a good life'. Stocker's point is that the non-'positive' emotions are in fact good because they are necessary ways of experiencing, dealing with, and resolving the conflicts and ambivalences of daily life as we know it, and that 'not to have these problems is not to be a person like us'.[126]

Combined with the insights expressed in section 1.1 about what really enters into personhood and the well-being of human beings, Stocker's suggestions pave the way for the line of argument that I shall follow in subsequent chapters. I do not intend to unfurl a banner emblazoned with the phrase 'All the "negative" emotions are good'. However, I want to argue, along naturalist lines, that the emotions of pride and jealousy, when properly formed, experienced, and displayed, can be morally justified as having a highly important, immediate part to play in the construction of a good human life. Before these ideas can be endowed with form and outline, it is necessary to spend some time unravelling the notions of moral justifiability and the conditions of a good (well-rounded, virtuous) life. That will be the task of the next two chapters, and our first destination there will be a quick stopover in the land of general moral theory.

2

JUSTIFYING EMOTIONS
The need for moral theory

2.1 Human nature as the foundation of moral theory

An emotion is morally justified, as we saw in the preceding section, if it has been rationally arrived at and is morally fitting in the given circumstances. But how do we judge what is morally fitting in any given circumstances? If we are to make further headway on our journey towards the moral justification of pride and jealousy, we cannot ignore Nussbaum's warning from section 1.1 about the futility of discussing what role particular emotions play in morality without first defending an overall normative view.[1] In other words, we are required to look for a moral theory that not only gives us satisfactory answers about what to *do* or not to *do* (in the ordinary sense) in our everyday dealings with other people, but also which emotions to *feel* (and in what proportion) or not to *feel*.

Textbooks in philosophy will tell us that there are three basic moral theories to choose from: *deontology*, *utilitarianism*, and *virtue ethics*, the last of which has (re)emerged as a serious candidate for allegiance during the past quarter of a century or so. Sometimes, the latter two are classified together as having a consequentialist or teleological orientation, defining 'the right' in terms of 'the good' while deontology insists on the priority of 'the right', but such labels are less helpful than a careful look at the details of each theory. I shall commence with deontology in the present section, and then turn to virtue ethics and utilitarianism in sections 2.2 and 2.3, respectively. While I cannot avoid abstract theoretical considerations altogether, nor a short detour in the present section out of the territory of 'pure' morality or psychology into the realm of politics, my emphasis will be on the way in which these three theories can or cannot satisfactorily make sense of our emotions and guide our emotional life. To anticipate a bit, I argue that the prevailing deontological theory of our times, namely liberalism, yields too thin a conception of the good life to guide us here, and that virtue ethics fails to give us determinate enough counsel in times of moral and emotional conflict. What I offer instead is Millian utilitarianism with a generous helping of Aristotelian naturalism. As a matter of fact, I think that a sophisticated

form of utilitarianism may provide us with a convincing account of the emotions, and of our moral life in general.

According to deontological theories, we are bound morally by universal categorical principles laid down by God, natural laws, or reason. It has become fashionable of late to write the first potential source off as irrelevant in an age of secularisation. How can a divine universal law exist without a divine universal law-giver, and if 'God is dead', is not everything morally permissible? This objection also hits indirectly at the second source, natural laws, and thereby at common conceptions of human rights as anchored in such laws: for John Locke's early justification of natural laws, echoed in the US Constitution and reflected in most modern human rights agendas, ultimately presupposes the existence of a supreme benevolent being who has placed us in a world where natural laws can be discovered. Kant famously tried to eschew such an objection by formulating a deontological principle grounded in human reason alone, arguing that reason requires us to follow universalisable maxims. Although most people will find themselves in agreement with some of the maxims derivable from Kant's 'categorical imperative' – for instance, the injunction to respect all human beings – it has, however, become a truism of late that since any given behaviour can be described in various ways, applying Kant's test of universalisability may yield contradictory results depending on how the maxim of action is defined. For example, the 'same behaviour' can be seen both as that of 'returning a borrowed knife' and 'giving a potential murderer a weapon to chop off his wife's head', with only the first maxim being universalisable. Moreover, for those interested in the moral role of the emotions, Kantianism does not offer much help as it denies moral value to any action stemming from desire. Giving money to a beggar out of compassion thus *does not*, for Kantians, constitute a morally admirable course of action, while giving money in the absence of compassion (or preferably, in the face of a contrary emotional thrust), simply because reason dictates it, *does*, since only the latter requires effort and self-sacrifice.[2] Maintaining such a view clearly does not hold out much prospect of reasonable emotional guidance.

In spite of its theoretical trials and tribulations, deontological thought continues to nourish the reigning political ideology in modern Western democracies: *liberalism*. The most widely discussed attempt in recent year to give liberalism a firm deontological footing is that of John Rawls's theory of justice.[3] Given the prodigious attention paid to this theory in philosophical and political circles, I assume that the reader has some familiarity with it. To rehearse briefly, Rawls defines a morally and politically well-ordered society as a scheme of co-operation for reciprocal advantage regulated by principles chosen by rational persons under 'a veil of ignorance' (that is, not knowing beforehand which position they will occupy in the society). Because of their lack of information in this initial position, rational choosers will, for

instance, opt for a principle of distribution enjoining that primary goods be distributed equally unless any inequalities are to the advantage of the least favoured. More generally speaking, the supposed fairness of the initial position yields *deontological* moral principles in the sense that they will appeal to all rational persons irrespective of their (diverse) substantive conceptions of the good life; the right remains firmly prior to the good.

So-called 'communitarians' have loudly criticised Rawls's conception of the *self* of rational choice, as *disembodied* (alienated from its material constitutive ends) and *disembedded* (not rooted in any real society, lacking in 'social personhood'), and see his theory as little but the topmost froth of Kantian rationalism and the last dregs of value subjectivism gulped down together.[4] Two other kinds of objections to Rawls's theory and the liberal enterprise in general are, however, more pertinent to our present purposes, concerning firstly the thinness of its conception of primary goods, and secondly its proneness to a vertiginous slide into a much more severe form of relativism – both of which have serious implications for our understanding of the emotions.

To start with the first point, liberals do rely on a certain notion of goodness, but since this assumption must not, as Rawls stresses, 'jeopardize the prior place of the concept of right', the theory of primary goods is 'restricted to the bare essentials'. Such a 'thin' theory only embraces those goods which rational individuals, whatever else they want, will desire as prerequisites for carrying our their chosen plans of life. They will prefer a wider to a narrower liberty, a greater rather than a smaller share of wealth and income, and having secure bases of self-respect.[5] If this list is substantially added to, liberals fear that the all-important ideals of *pluralism* and *multiculturalism* will be undermined: individuals (perhaps coming from diverse cultural backgrounds) will no longer be free to follow their own conceptions of the good life, although each conception may be as warranted as any other. Since radically different 'life plans' can be equally valid, the state must remain neutral about the value placed upon different goods or ways of living, apart from the 'bare essentials' mentioned above. Not only must the state resist forcing people into allegedly 'good' activities; it must not even subsidise such activities or publicly advertise their merits.[6] The chief liberal character ideal is that of *autonomy*; liberal moral and political philosophy is all about laying down 'procedural rules' and 'prerequisites' for *the game* to be played while the contents of the game itself are left open for the autonomous participants to decide. Any complaints about the thinness of this liberal conception are immediately written off as meddlesome, paternalistic, and authoritarian.

When confronted with educational issues, liberals tend to tiptoe around controversial issues. On the one hand, they will, at least in their more earthbound moments, accept that education, be it moral education or that of the traditional school disciplines, must aim at making students good citizens

and help them to function both as natural and as social beings. On the other hand, they will deny that this requirement entails instilling in students any substantive conception of the good life: any conception of the proper way of acting or reacting. At times, liberals seem to be at a complete loss about what should be taught in schools, apart from the 'three R's' and other bare basics; at any rate, whatever is taught must be conducive to the students' ability to choose without telling them what to choose.[7] It is no coincidence that many contemporary writers on moral education claim to have come up against a brick wall of 'teacher neutrality' on moral issues, sometimes verging on excess in the direction of 'political correctness'. Teachers, bred in the liberal tradition, tell us that instead of transmitting specific values or moral beliefs, they take care to respect students' diverse beliefs and emotions, and not to offend those of opposing convictions or characters.[8] They will thus avoid discouraging any emotional traits except those clearly inimical to a liberal frame of mind. To be sure, teachers will not be violating any liberal principle by nourishing students' *compassion* (as long as they are not too specific about what to feel compassionate about) or dispelling irrational *fear*, but much further emotional schooling will not appear proper. To questions such as those posed in the present book about the moral justifiability of pride and jealousy, a consistent liberal will have to answer: 'Well, the justifiability of pride depends on whether you have opted for the life of an ascetic hermit or an ambitious entrepreneur, and the justifiability of jealousy on the theory you happen to endorse about moral deserts, and (in the case of sexual jealousy) about the value of commitment in loving relationships'.

Perhaps these are all the answers that we can ask for. Perhaps we need to separate substantive considerations about the value of particular emotions in particular settings from our 'thin' moral discourse. But, then again, perhaps we do not. Before exploring a 'thick' Aristotelian alternative to the 'thin' liberal perspective, I will raise some questions about the ability of liberalism to keep the thin thread of goodness unbroken, that is, to prevent it from dissolving into the ultimate thinness of a postmodern void.

Notice that however pluralist and multicultural the liberal conception of the good life is, it distinguishes itself clearly from a more radically relativised *postmodern* multiculturalism or 'politics of difference'.[9] The liberal freedom to choose different ways of life is in the end anchored in an acknowledgement of the primary goods (however thin), the acceptance of the primary humanistic moral principles of freedom and fairness, and the Enlightenment conception of reason, truth, and personhood. These are unquestioned presuppositions supplying the background and basis for all the subsequent procedural rules: we want to live in peace and pursue our own interests, and we are able to understand other people, however different their specific interests are from ours, and their respective concerns with peace and freedom. But why, would a postmodernist ask, should a fundamentalist Muslim, for

instance, accept these presuppositions? Given the communitarian critique of Rawls's original choice position, what if anything remains of the 'bare essentials' which are taken for granted in liberal theories? Why not reject humanism and Enlightenment aspirations altogether?

Rawls has in subsequent works denied that his intention in *A Theory of Justice* was to formulate more than a conception of justice for 'us' in Western liberal democracies; refining principles which we already more or less share: 'Whether justice as fairness can be extended to a general political conception for different kinds of societies existing under different historical and social conditions, or whether it can be extended to a general moral conception, or a significant part thereof, are altogether separate questions. I avoid prejudging these larger questions one way or another',[10] the 'new' Rawls remarks. I am not saying that Rawls has turned into, or that he always was, a postmodern pluralist; he still believes that the original position places universally formal demands on the process of political or moral justification, at least for those who concern themselves with fairness: an essentially anti-postmodernist claim. However, the development of Rawls's thought helps to enlighten the way in which a thin liberal doctrine is likely to slip and slide into increasing thinness. We have already seen how threadbare the advice is that a traditional liberal can give us about the justifiability of particular emotions, and hence about emotional upbringing. The direction in which Rawls's political thought has headed gives us clues about the inevitability of further slippage. One may wonder, given the liberal rejection of a common human nature, where a consistent liberal can reasonably halt the slippage and say: 'No more, no more'.

The starting point for an alternative to liberalism is the question: 'Why, if you accept any universal values at all, do you not go for a much thicker conception of the good life?' Martha Nussbaum has in recent years, in a series of interconnected essays,[11] suggested an Aristotelian alternative, arguing that Rawls's pessimism about the possibility of a universal agreement on values, going beyond the humanist presuppositions and the thin conception of the primary goods, is 'both unjustified and dangerous'.[12] Forswearing the liberal solution for a kind of fundamentalist Aristotelianism does not lead her to embrace Aristotle's well-known racial and sexual prejudices (about slaves' natural lack of practical reason, women's lack of authority in governing their own lives, etc.), nor to endorse his more parochial concerns (such as his emphasis on stringent physical education). Indeed, Nussbaum and most others who have tried to reintroduce Aristotelianism into the moral and political arena take it for granted that it is possible to separate the wheat from the chaff in Aristotle's moral teaching: that his 'inessential' empirical blunders of application can be eradicated while his 'essential' theory and principles remain intact.[13]

The basic idea behind Nussbaum's version of Aristotelianism is that we can construct an objective, universal conception of human nature without

invoking Aristotle's (or for that matter any controversial) metaphysics. What we need is simply a conception derived from the 'human experience of life and value': the shared ideas enshrined in the self-understandings of the 'many and the wise'.[14] The notion of the *arête* (the proper function or excellence) of human beings must be derived from the way in which such beings think, act, and feel when they function well and successfully, just as the *arête* of man qua musician must be observed from the manner in which he plays well. For Aristotle, signs of the excellence of human beings are – to cite the words of our poet Stephansson – the 'unerring thought' of theoretical wisdom, the 'artful hand' of practical expertise, and the 'true and proper' heart of moral virtue. But how do we ascertain that these excellences are characteristically human? The answer is: by exploring the evaluative, narrative beliefs of people at different times and places about what it means to be human, as opposed to being a beast or a god. To find out what our nature is 'seems to be one and the same thing as to find out what we deeply believe to be most important and indispensable'.[15] Here, an understanding of the emotions occupies a central role, for:

> in the myths and stories that are central to most cultures, the notion of the human being and the human life assumes a special salience, mapping the domains of fellow feeling as it maps specific emotions within that domain. […] depictions of interaction between local and distant people rarely portray the distant as simply monsters: they are shown to have needs and aims similar to one's own, and it is this that makes them intelligible and candidates for story-telling, though in many ways their concrete beliefs and practices may differ. Stories of ogres and monsters, by contrast, and contrasting stories of needless divinities, map the boundary of the human from the other side, showing the salience of certain elements in a human life by showing how weird and unrecognisable a way of life looks without them. […] The child learns that humans have both cultural and individual differences in character and way of life, and that these differences are frequently correlated with emotional differences. But she learns as well the sameness expressed in and through the differences, as a sameness without which its own activities of identification and empathy would come to nothing.[16]

The conception of human beings and their good which emerges from Nussbaum's analysis is one which she terms a 'thick vague conception':[17] 'thick' as opposed to the liberal 'thin' conception in that it includes a much wider measure of essentially human characteristics; 'vague' in that it admits of various manifestations, since there can be many different ways to lead a good human life. In spite of its openness, what stands out in Nussbaum's account is her objectivism about human nature, resting on empirical trans-

cultural comparisons, similar to those performed a century ago by the poet Stephansson, or myself a few years ago in Taiwan (see preface). Stephansson's 'hunch' that every nation comprises persons 'with a similar mind, a similar heart' was strengthened no end in the international hotchpotch of nineteenth-century Canada. His conclusion was that we all share a common human core, although some nations may be 'separated by such a distant mother tongue and fatherland that no ferry has ever been known to pass between them'. The simple observation that the same 'yearnings' and 'thoughts' characterise people in different societies at different times, people sharing 'eyes of the same ilk', is the mainstay of the evaluative naturalist objectivism under scrutiny here, as distinct from a metaphysical and/or non-evaluative biological objectivism.

For the pumpkin of casual observations and anecdotal evidence to turn into a coach, we need to scrutinise more deeply the essence of our common humanity. To return to Nussbaum, she differentiates between two different sorts of universal human capabilities: *internal* ('I-capabilities') and *external* ('E-capabilities').[18] The internal ones are conditions of the person that make him qualified to choose the various valued functions. Parts of these conditions are inborn but most of them are trained through education: the mental preconditions of autonomous choice, the moral character-base which enables us to deliberate and act or feel correctly, the bodily capabilities which must be in place for us to be able to function properly in the world. These I-capabilities, however, may be present and still lack circumstances for their activation. So E-capabilities encompass both the internal ones and also the external material and social conditions that make available to the individual the option of each valued function. From the commonness of human capabilities and conditions (our mortality, our bodily functions, our capacity for pleasure and pain, our cognitive abilities, our early infant development, our humour and play, etc.) Nussbaum then derives a list of basic human functions to be promoted through educational and political measures.[19]

The political implications of Nussbaum's Aristotelianism are far-reaching.[20] Instead of state neutrality on major issues, the job of the state's governing bodies becomes 'broad and deep'.[21] For judgements about how a country is doing, and how well its government is performing, will depend to a great extent on how its citizens are (made) able to function in the central human ways.[22] The chief aim of the state thus becomes that of the distribution to individuals of the conditions under which a good human life can be chosen and lived; to move each and every one of them across a threshold of capability into circumstances of informed, autonomous choice and the actualisation of that which has been chosen.[23] To return to the poetic visions of Stephansson, which neatly fall into line with Nussbaum's ideals, the fact that human nature, as a battleground of good and evil, remains essentially unchanged does not mean that social progress is impossible. Quite the opposite: we know that 'shortage intensifies our evilness, / whereas prosperity

cultivates our best traits'. Through improved economic conditions, health and education reforms, and the dissemination of knowledge, the 'dawn reaches numbers increased': the boundaries of the realisation of humanness are expanded. The poet envisions a 'future more noble and pleasant' where the 'good' has been made 'into better' by combined human effort. We do not need human eugenics, any more than we need breeding of the birch tree, for it to prosper better; we simply need to find more fertile soil for it to grow in.

These political implications – culminating in the 'fascinating convergence' that Nussbaum envisions between Aristotle's ideals and the policies of modern Scandinavian social democracies[24] – are largely outside the province of the present study. However, what is relevant here is her insistence that an Aristotelian thick theory of the good will require the state to take a firm stand on many educational and cultural issues eschewed by liberal authorities. It will, for instance, have to support educational programmes aimed at fostering the basic human capabilities, and it must make sure that the content of these programmes is conducive to human flourishing, including 'the good functioning of the imagination and emotions'.[25] Questions such as 'is proper jealousy part of a potentially good human life?' or 'is pride likely to contribute more to human flourishing than humility?' re-emerge as intelligible and salient, which they would hardly be for a consistent liberal. And if the answer to one or both of them is 'yes', then something had better be done about it in the home and the school.

However, in shunning one kind of vice, Nussbaum is careful not to run to the other extreme. Her Aristotelian conception of the human good is 'vague' as well as 'thick', that is, it allows for considerable latitude concerning the actualisation of the major human capabilities. The constitutive circumstances of human life, while broadly shared, can be realised in different ways in different societies and among different individuals, allowing for 'contextual particularity' and a variety of talents and tastes.[26] The 'thick vague conception' is not *paternalistic*, for paternalism would be counter-productive; it is not *absolutist*, for there are usually many good ways to reach the same destination, and it is not *holistic* in that it accepts the specificity of individual needs and interests. In the end, the ways of life of the ascetic hermit and the ambitious entrepreneur can be equally sound, just as the liberal maintains: not simply, à la liberalism, because they have been *chosen* as ways of life, but rather because they happen to be equally fruitful realisations of the same basic capabilities.

One might be tempted to bring this section to an early conclusion by saying that, given that this is a book about emotions, and that Aristotelianism yields a morally much richer account of emotions than does Rawlsianism, we should simply opt for the former and carry on from there. However, such a manoeuvre would beg too many important questions, and also obscure the way in which the choice at present is not really (or at least not *only*) that between Aristotle and Rawls, but rather between 'Aristotle

and Nietzsche'[27] – or shall we say between a broadly Aristotelian naturalism and a radically relativistic postmodernism. I have already suggested that liberal pluralism may, given its own premises, be prone to slide into a more relativistic form. Many thinkers, especially in Continental Europe but also from the ranks of traditional Anglo-American philosophy, have taken the plunge into postmodernism, either directly or via the liberal route.[28] Something needs to be said here about postmodernism as a 'moral theory', or if you like, 'anti-theory', especially in so far as it relates to human emotions.

A vast array of motley, and sometimes conflicting, ideas tends to be accumulated under the rubric of 'postmodernism'. However, some basic (mainly epistemological) tenets tend to unite them. To give a brief list: thoughts and intentions are merely word-like and have no intrinsic connection to a sense or a referent. They are simply a flux of text without a fixed foundation. There is no privileged point, such as the speaker's intention or contact with external reality, that confers significance on such a text. Hence, no perspective in looking at the world is better than any other. Instead of objectivity, which is a howler, comes (at best) solidarity within our own language group: our own culture or sub-culture. There exists no truth, only convention. 'Justification' is a sociological, not a logical, concept. Science is no better than any other system, for instance, those of magic or fantasy. Indeed, there is no common philosophy and science, only philosophies and sciences. Traditional science and philosophy, including logic, must jettison their grandiose claims and view themselves more modestly as just another set of narratives. There is no unitary privileged history either, only different histories. Basically, postmodernism signals the 'end of history', the end in the belief of overcoming and learning from the past and the present in pursuit of the new. All things considered, our lives and the whole universe are but pieces of fiction. There is no autonomous individual, no common human nature. All social relationships are fundamentally relationships of power with no freedom residing anywhere. The post-Enlightenment, humanist, and modernist ideals of knowledge, progress and inter-human understanding are but illusory 'grand narratives' which must be given up like all other grand narratives (including the Marxist and liberal ones) as at best futile, at worst recipes for barbaric excesses when people attempt to put their ideals into practice. Acknowledging all of this then leads to scepticism (Derrida), stoicism (Lyotard, Lacan, Foucault), hedonism (Barthes), or cynicism/nihilism (Rorty, Baudrillard).[29]

Few serious attempts have been made to systematise these scattered visions of gloom and doom into a doctrinal body or to bring out their relevance for the life, morality, and emotions of individuals. The most successful one is perhaps an early attempt by Fredric Jameson to highlight the difference between postmodernism and modernism via contrasting conceptual pairs, including:

Modernism:	*Postmodernism:*
Depth	Depthlessness
Historicity	Lack of historicity
Expressive emotions	'Intensities'
Dualism of inside and outside	Monism
Alienation	Fragmentation
Individuality	Loss of individuality[30]

Jameson fleshes out the nature of the first three of these dichotomies through a comparison of two paintings: Vincent Van Gogh's representation of peasant shoes in *A Pair of Boots*, and Andy Warhol's *Diamond Dust Shoes*. Although the first painting has been interpreted in various ways, the different readings share a common hermeneutical core: its objectal form is taken as a clue for some vaster reality which replaces it as its ultimate truth. By contrast, in the case of Warhol's painting, we simply have a random collection of objects hanging together on the canvas like turnips, objects which do not admit of any deeper interpretation than merely being there. In other words, depth has been replaced by superficiality: by surface or multiple surfaces. This goes hand in hand with the second characteristic of postmodernism: loss of historicity or context, both as far as physical world itself is concerned, which has become a set of texts, and the coherence of each individual's life (see the fifth dichotomy), as postmodernism abandons all sense of historical continuity and individual unity. With the reduction of experience to a series of unrelated presents, a third feature of postmodern culture emerges as the 'waning of affect': emotions such as anger, pride, jealousy, or fear, which presuppose some cognitive content and thus the underlying self-identity of the person, are replaced by 'intensities'. These are free-floating and impersonal instances of euphoria, which seem to amount to some kind of orgasmic, hallucinogenic *feels*. 'Jouissance' is the French term for it, about which Barthes and other postmodernists have written at length, contrasting it with 'pleasure': the latter being reserved for the lower enjoyment of the rabble, while 'jouissance' signifies the special euphoric pleasure of texts – or of the realisation that everything is a text – for the enlightened.

This brings us to the fourth feature of postmodernism on which Jameson sheds light, a feature that appears to me to underscore the first three: the rejection of the whole traditional philosophical metaphysics of inside and outside. Thus, all the common dualisms of essence versus appearance, latent versus manifest, authenticity versus inauthenticity, and signifier versus a fixed signified object are done away with. Instead we are offered a monistic system (or anti-system) of life qua text, practice, or play. Fifth, the much-cherished modernist concept of alienation also goes down the drain, for alienation and its sister expressions of anxiety and isolation, as depicted for example in Edward Munch's *The Scream*, presuppose a true self from which

a person's less authentic self can become alienated, and where 'liberation' refers to a reunification of the two. However, if no such true self exists – the Cartesian 'I', implying a self capable of intentional, transparent communication and unmediated action, being rejected – we are left with a fragmented self where schizophrenia displaces anxiety and where liberation is exposed as an illusion. The sixth dichotomy is little but an implication of the others: 'the death of the subject', the loss of individuality and authorship, is a natural consequence of psychological fragmentation.

Since Jameson wrote his piece, there has been a major shift in 'mainstream' postmodernism from an *uncritical* and playful stance to *critical* postmodernism, the latter commonly being referred to as 'politics of difference' or 'critical regionalism'. While both uncritical and critical postmodernism contextualise and pluralise, rejecting the monolithic and homogeneous in the name of diversity, the critical version claims that to the extent that the world makes any sense at all, it is at the local level where the limited scale makes some kind of mutual understanding possible. Instead of revelling in eclecticism, one thus sees in critical postmodernism the opposite reaction: the abandonment of placelessness and fragmentation through the search for personal and collective identity: place-identity, group identity.[31] C. West talks about a new kind of cultural worker in the making, associated with the new politics of difference which is supposed to empower oppressed groups and individuals.[32] Localism (or parochialism), nationalism, and even religious fundamentalism are suddenly the postmodern words of the day.

Criticisms of postmodernism are legion. Many focus on its *logical* inconsistencies. The 'boomerang-effect' of radical moral or epistemological relativism has been discussed since the days of Socrates: if everything is relative, then the statement that everything is relative is also relative. This purportedly hits at postmodern relativists who seem to be saying that it is always morally wrong to say that something is always morally wrong. However, modern-day relativists have devised various ways in which to formulate their views while avoiding such inconsistencies. Moreover, postmodernists are particularly immune to these criticisms since they revel in paradoxes and reject '(phallo)logocentrism': the (male) Western obsession with logic. What might give them more cause for concern is the *moral* paradox between intention and outcome entailed by the postmodernist project.[33] Postmodernists claim, no doubt honestly, that they want to uphold the interests of minority groups (women, ethnic and racial minorities, colonised peoples, etc.). However, their 'theory' in fact contributes to the increasing ghettoisation and disempowerment of these groups through its fetishisms of locality and social grouping. More precisely, while emphasising the authenticity of 'different voices', postmodernism paradoxically shuts them off from access to more universal sources of power by ghettoising them within the opaque specificities of their own language-games. Instead of becoming active participants on the world stage, minorities

continue to be marginalised. One could even go further and say that post-modernism not only sidelines such groups but can, in fact, lead to racism, as the first step to racism is always the emphasis on cultural difference and inaccessibility rather than kinship and mutual understanding.

A similar observation, and one highly relevant to our present concerns, is that postmodernists 'cheat', as Nussbaum puts it, when they commend their view to us on the grounds of *compassion*, saying that it will help the situation of the excluded and oppressed. For to experience compassion – that painful emotion felt towards the pain or suffering of other people – one must be able to identify with their pain; that is, one must be able to understand them as similar enough to us to count as potential fellow-sufferers. In other words, compassion requires that very belief in a common humanity which postmodernism abandons.[34]

I would go even further than Nussbaum by saying that the postmodernist view of emotions not only contradicts their moral teachings, but also that it renders the emotions themselves, our own as well as those of others, unintelligible. Recall that for postmodernists no true self exists; the Cartesian '*sum*' of '*cogito ergo sum*' is rejected and life is defined as a series of unrelated presents. But then it becomes a paradox how even the limited scale, local group-identity sought after in critical postmodernism can be achieved: if there is even no affinity between 'me' now and 'me' at the next moment, how can there be any affinity between me and those belonging to my closest group/culture? How can one howl with one's own fellow wolves if there is nothing to refer to as 'oneself'? Moreover, if there is no '*sum*', there is presumably no '*cogito*' either (no consistent thought), for a precondition of such a thought seems to be that there exists an 'I' at least stable enough to work out the thought from its premises to its conclusion. We thus see that the postmodernist 'waning of affect', the replacement of ordinary emotions with 'intensities', is much more than a simple factual description of the 'postmodern situation'; it is a logical consequence of the basic tenets of postmodernism itself. For these tenets do not allow for the existence of any permanent cognitions or concerns out of which emotions could be formed.

Tellingly, postmodernists tend to be obsessed with *the body* and its 'languages', witness hundreds of recent books and artistic exhibitions exploring that theme. After the person's self and its emotions have been disposed of, the only irreducible in the postmodernist scheme of things becomes the body: as the 'site' at which all the diverse forms of power and oppression are ultimately registered. Since there is no significant conflict left between beliefs, drives or emotions, what remains is only the tension between (socially constructed) bodies and those social constraints which cut against them. What an anti-climax to the history of philosophical thought which has traditionally considered the stable mental 'form' of the person to confer identity and permanence on the essentially unstable 'matter' out of which the person is made!

It is psychologically and historically, if less philosophically, interesting to speculate about the origin and the fascination of postmodernism. Ellen Dissanayake ascribes it to the hyper-literacy (involuted self-consciousness) and 'scriptocentrism' of a literate mentality which, being disembedded from nature and genuine human experiences, seeks refuge in ivory towers where texts rather than people matter.[35] Other ad hoc explanations, such as the postmodernists' radical disillusionment with Marxist and other utopian solutions to the world's problems, may be even closer to the mark. Nevertheless, to avoid the historical fallacy, one should try to argue philosophically with postmodernists: ask them, for instance, whether they have considered the variety of expressions in our language(s) with the terms 'good' and 'bad' where some locutions may easily admit of a relativistic understanding ('Porridge tastes good', 'Jazz sounds bad') while others do not ('It is bad for children to be sexually molested', '*Schadenfreude* is a bad emotion').[36] Should such a conversation with the postmodernist break down, as it probably will, I must appeal to the reader by telling a simple story: When I first went to Britain to study, next to me in my hall of residence there lived a young man from an underdeveloped country. He had never been exposed to Western culture before, and many of his ideas and attitudes seemed to me to be outlandish and bizarre. It was all too easy to jump to the conclusion that inter-human understanding between us was impossible. However, a couple of months later, when he fell in love with a girl in the same hall, he started to express the same beliefs and behave in exactly in the same way as I would have. The subtle advances, the fear of rejection, the jealousy upon seeing the girl shower 'undue' attention upon a third party; it was all there. The point of this story is simple: if one believes, as seems to be the most natural thing to do, that my neighbour was in *love*, that he experienced *jealousy* and (more generally) that I could *understand* what was going on in his mind, one cannot endorse postmodernism which renders such emotions unintelligible and such understanding impossible.[37]

To retrace our steps: liberalism does make sense of our emotions, but only to a limited extent since it fails to take seriously our commonality, reducing it to people's barest common concern with external goods, liberty, and self-esteem. Hence, the advice it can give us about emotional justification is too threadbare to provide guidance regarding many of our most intimate and personal experiences, or to aid us much in the emotional upbringing of our children and pupils. Even more seriously, since the idea of essential humanness has been abandoned, the very foundations of liberal morality crack and tilt. In this the postmodernists do have a point: if we accept the thrust of the trenchant communitarian critique of Rawls's original choosers as lacking in personhood, little if anything seems to be necessarily decided in a liberal universe. We will have to rely, instead, on a consensus among real persons regarding basic liberal values, but the problem is that no such value is basic enough to be immune from rejection by fundamentalists and fanatics.

Consequently, liberalism seems doomed to collapse into a form of radical relativism: the postmodernist dream comes true. In this sense, postmodernism may best be understood as the lunatic fringe of liberalism itself. However, postmodernism yields a disintegrated self, incapable of emotion. As long as the postmodernist does not 'cheat', his life becomes one of, at best, detached amusement, at worst, suicidal despair. So while the liberal course merely presents us with an unreal, uprooted self and an *impoverished* account of emotion, postmodernism brings this course to its logical conclusion of emotional *unintelligibility*. If we believe that some sense can be made of our lives at all, or simply – to take the most specific of examples – that both I and my student neighbour mentioned above could have experienced the same kind of jealousy in similar situations, then nothing short of a rejection of postmodernism is called for. Moreover, by implication, liberalism which ultimately entails postmodernism must also be rejected.

As an antidote to the reigning deontological theory of the day and its 'lunatic fringe', I have presented Nussbaum's Aristotelianism, rooted in Aristotle's basic observation that 'in our travels we can see how every human being is akin and beloved to a human being'.[38] This affinity and affiliation reveal themselves in our 'grounding experiences', those spheres of experience which figure in more or less any human life and give sense to the inter-human virtues and emotions. For an Aristotelian, the famous Kohlbergian claim that every culture has 'its own bag' of virtues and emotions (see section 6.2)[39] blatantly ignores the amount of attunement, recognition, and overlap that actually obtains across cultures.[40] This is not the place to go deeper into the issue of moral objectivity. However, it is clear that if we aim to say something substantial and important about the justification of particular emotions, our springboard must be naturalist, in the broad Aristotelian sense, rather than liberal or postmodernist.

As a final note in this section, let me mention the common complaint that Nussbaum's (or for that matter any kind of) Aristotelian naturalism is *conservative*. Politically speaking, at least, this seems to be a most curious claim. Is social democratic theory more politically conservative than liberalism? It is of course true that Nussbaum takes her cue from ideas which are 'out of the ark', historically speaking, namely, 2,300 years old, but 'old' is surely not the same as 'conservative'. If 'conservative' is taken to mean, in line with an ordinary way of speaking, 'supportive of the status quo', 'aiming at the stability or reinforcement of existing categories', then Nussbaum's Aristotle is anything but conservative, while 'critical postmodernism' is the very acme of conservatism. Indeed, in the field of morality and emotions, Aristotelian naturalism suggests a radical departure from existing practices of traditional liberal education, by condoning a much deeper and richer programme of character formation than does liberalist, not to mention postmodernist, pluralism. If Nussbaum and the present book are on the right track, we should not shy away from questions about

the justification of emotions such as pride and jealousy, nor from making practical use of the answers through emotional guidance and coaching.

2.2 The shortcomings of virtue ethics: moral and emotional conflict

Let us continue our search for a moral theory that can guide our emotional life and provide satisfying answers to questions about the justification of particular emotions. Having shown, in the preceding section, the poverty of liberalism in this respect, and the superiority of Aristotelian naturalism, the next logical step seems to be to examine the strengths and weaknesses of a theory that has emerged as a result of, or at least in conjunction with, the recent resurgence of Aristotelianism.

During the last quarter of a century, a remarkably high number of eminent philosophers have gathered around a theory of *virtue ethics* (hereafter, for brevity's sake: *VE*). It has also received a warm welcome outside the confines of academic moral philosophy, especially in other surrounding disciplines; so much so that many people seem to consider *VE* our new balm of Gilead, soothing and curing all the ailments of modern morality. Given the variety of claims made in the name of *VE*, it might perhaps be more profitable to talk about moral *theories* than a single theory;[41] however, the different conceptions tend to revolve around a common core. According to this 'core', an action is morally right if and only if it is an exercise of a moral virtue, the virtues being considered those character traits a human being needs to achieve *eudaimonia* in the Aristotelian sense: to flourish or live well.

For our present purposes, it is relevant to note that there seems to obtain a strong connection between philosophers' interest in questions of emotional significance and justification, on the one hand, and their adherence to *VE* on the other. Philosophers have either been led to embrace *VE* because of its supposed superiority over other theories in accounting for the moral salience of emotions[42] or, conversely, they have leaned towards *VE* first and from that perspective concluded that only *VE* could make sense of such salience.[43] This interdependence may seem no coincidence, for in taking up Aristotle's conception of the potential virtuousness of emotions, *VE* not only tells us that the morally right thing to do is to *act* virtuously; it also enjoins us to *react* and *feel* virtuously, that is, to experience the morally right emotion in the right situation. Thus, *VE* upholds a direct link between moral rightness and the justification of emotions, which many people think is understated, if not totally missing, in competing deontological and utilitarian theories.

Traditionally, critics of *VE* – utilitarian ones in particular – consider its potential virtues overwhelmed by two daunting weaknesses. First, the so-called *self-centredness objection* alleges that *VE* makes the agents themselves

the focus of self-concerning sanctimonious attention, hence obscuring and ignoring the essential other-concern of morality.[44] To couch this objection in Bernard Williams's well-known terms, followers of *VE* will be guilty of a certain kind of 'moral self-indulgence', constantly asking themselves what they can do to preserve their own virtuousness; caring not so much about others as about themselves caring about others.[45] Second, one of the most important demands which tends to be made of a moral theory is that it is able to provide us with some kind of a decision procedure, instructing us in what to do. However, the complaint inherent in the standard *action-guiding objection* is that *VE* fails precisely in this respect to deliver the goods – that it has (in many cases at least) insufficient resources to specify how we should act.

I shall return briefly to the self-centredness objection later in this section, but my main focus will be on the action-guiding objection. Unfortunately, discussions of this objection have in general been conducted almost entirely in terms of *VE*'s ability or inability to guide us in our *actions*. I propose – in line with the purpose of this book – to redress this imbalance by concentrating on the *emotional* sphere where *VE* encounters, I maintain, even more severe trials. Recall that *VE* not only demands virtuous actions but also virtuous emotions. Thus, it is crucial that we reformulate the standard action-guiding objection[46] as an *emotion/action-guiding* one, and ask: Can *VE* reliably guide our emotional life by telling us what to feel in particular situations?

Consider a case such as the following, fleshed out from one of the rhetorical questions with which the present book started: I fail to get promotion in my company because the high-ranking job for which I was vying goes to the boss's nephew. He was, on all accounts, a much less-qualified candidate for the post than I, and the only plausible reason anyone can see for his being promoted over me is sheer nepotism. To complicate matters, the nephew happens to be a colleague and a good friend of mine. Moreover, he has recently had to cope with tragic family events and everyone agrees that he deserves a break. Now, the question arises: Should I be *happy for* the 'break' he got, or should I be *jealous*? The problem is that both these emotional responses seem to be potentially justifiable if we look at the situation from different angles. (I am getting a little ahead of my argument at this juncture by assuming that jealousy is *ever* morally justified, but I ask the reader to grant me that point here; if not, simply envisage some other everyday case of emotional conflict: between anger and gratitude, grief and joy, etc.) Yet, these responses incorporate conflicting evaluations and imply conflicting wishes: the former, a positive evaluation and the wish that the status quo be maintained; the latter, a negative evaluation and the wish that the post which the nephew got should, ideally, be taken away from him and given to me.[47]

If a moral theory cannot tell us which emotional response is the (more) appropriate one in a common everyday situation like that, or at least guide

us towards the considerations which we need to accommodate when resolving such conflicts, then we may question its usefulness, and even whether it really is a moral theory. To restate our example in the context of *VE*: an emotion/action-guiding objection will allege that while *VE* would enjoin us to be jealous in situations which call for proper jealousy, and happy-for in situations which call for that emotion; its lack of an overarching 'first principle' means that it has no way of adjudicating between the conflicting demands of these two potentially virtuous emotional responses in the *same* situation. Notice that the complaint is not that *VE* does not, generally speaking, furnish us with various suggestions about what to do and feel via the diverse virtues it upholds; the alleged weakness is rather that it does not provide any principle to which we can appeal in cases of conflict between the demands of the particular virtues.

Before considering internal *VE*-responses to this objection, let me briefly sketch an alternative strategy commonly invoked by virtue ethicists. The strategy is to draw on some *additional moral principle(s)*, external but complementary to *VE*, to obviate problems of adjudication. Exploring such manoeuvres tends to the development of my argument, for the strategy of supplementary principles – in particular, the examples it adduces and the terms in which it is couched – reveals some striking limitations of the considerations that typically inform discussions of the objection in question. One conspicuous fact is how such discussions tend to be conducted through an investigation of a battery of far-fetched, but now all-too-familiar, scenarios with catchy titles: *accident*, *transplant*, *hospital*, *trolley*, *hostage*, *beggar*, and so forth. Let me quickly rehearse the development of Philippa Foot's ruminations on these scenarios. She is one of the most prominent virtue ethicists, many of the stock examples derive from her writings, and her train of thought is, I think, emblematic of a whole discursive tradition within and about *VE*.

Why is it wrong for a doctor to kill one (innocent, recovering) patient and use his organs as spare parts to graft on to five other needy patients (*transplant*), while it is right for the same doctor to save five patients and allow one to die when an ambulance brings in the victims of an *accident*, where it so happens that rescuing the one would take as much time as saving the other five altogether, and the doctor must choose between these two courses of action? An initial response, and indeed one to which some virtue ethicists would be sympathetic, is that the killing in the first case constitutes a direct *act* while allowing the injured person to die in the second is merely an *omission*; and that acts are (for some reasons external to *VE*) more morally significant than omissions. However, the act–omission distinction is beset by proverbial difficulties which render its moral significance dubious to say the least. Indeed, Foot herself only mentions this distinction in order to 'set it aside'.[48] In its place, she suggests another supplementary principle, embodied in the 'doctrine of double effect': that it

can be morally permissible to bring about morally negative outcomes as long as they are merely *foreseeable* consequences of some praiseworthy actions, but not directly *intended* as ends or as means to ends. In this sense, the death of the person in *transplant* would be intended, and hence morally wrong, but in *accident* only foreseeable and hence, given the details of that situation, permissible. Now this is a principle to which many famous virtue ethicists, including Elizabeth Anscombe, strongly adhere.[49] Other moral philosophers, especially those of utilitarian orientation, notably give it a wide berth as reifying a dangling and morally insignificant distinction.[50] That disagreement is not really the issue here, for Foot herself, in her much-quoted essay, 'The Problem of Abortion and the Doctrine of Double Effect', suggests a counter-example to this principle which relegates it to a 'subsidiary role': the example *(hospital)* of saving the lives of five patients in a hospital by the manufacture of a certain gas, but 'this inevitably releases lethal fumes into the room of another patient whom for some reason we are unable to move'. Although his death is merely foreseeable but not intended, according to the principle of double effect, the way it is brought about cannot count as morally acceptable.[51] These considerations led Foot to formulate a new morally crucial distinction: that between *negative duties* (duties of non-interference, of not causing injury) and *positive duties* (duties of bringing aid to others).[52] Where a negative and a positive duty come into conflict, such as in *hospital*, the latter duty must give way; however, in cases of conflict between duties of the same kind, we are allowed to give weight to quantitative differences: for instance, in Foot's *trolley*-case where she deems it permissible for the driver of a runaway tram to steer it onto a track where one man is working rather than another track where it would kill five railway workers.[53]

Foot considers this last case to exhibit a conflict between two negative duties.[54] But what if the tram was, by chance, heading in the direction of the five: would steering it onto the other track then also have counted as an exercise of a negative duty towards the five, or perhaps of a positive duty (since chance had doomed them already), accompanied by the violation of a negative duty towards the one, in which case the interference would have been impermissible? That Foot would incline towards the second option is evidenced by her analysis of the *hostage*-case, where a terrorist holding me and other innocent hostages will kill all of us unless I kill one of them first, in which case he will set me and the rest free. There, Foot condemns the killing of the one as totally unacceptable: as a violation of a negative duty which no positive duties can override irrespective of the number of people involved.[55] So freak happenings, originally beyond the control of the agent or even of anyone (as in *trolley*), seem to be able to make a moral difference. That is not the most troubling aspect here, though; what is more worrying is that it seems often to be totally *relative to description* what we choose to define as a positive and what as a negative duty. Is the agent in *hostage* faced

by the conflict of a negative and a positive duty, or two negative ones (not to bring about the death of one person versus not to bring about the death of more persons)? Similarly, was Sophie in Styron's *Sophie's Choice* faced by the positive duty of helping one of her children survive by handing the other child over to the Nazi officer and a negative one towards the one so sacrificed (in which case her decision was wrong), or two negative duties: not to have one child killed and not to have both children killed (in which case her decision was right)? The most plausible reason for saying that both *hostage* and *Sophie's choice* should *definitely* be analysed as cases of a conflict between a negative and a positive duty seems to be that a negative duty always involves omission while a positive one involves commission, but that reason lands us right back in the territory of the rejected act–omission distinction which Foot's new dichotomy was precisely meant to transcend.

To complicate matters even further, Foot later reinstated the principle of double effect as complementary to the positive–negative duty distinction, in order to make sense of a case where we allow a beggar to die by not giving him aid, so that his body will be available for medical research. Earlier, Foot explained the wrongness of *beggar* as a violation of a negative duty,[56] but realising that this put too much strain on the concept of a negative duty, she came to see our lack of charity there as a violation of a positive duty; not wrong primarily for that reason but rather because the beggar's death is directly intended as a means to an end.[57] Foot, however, neither explains how her earlier misgivings about the principle of double effect (recall *hospital*) have been cleared up, nor what is now supposed to be the precise relationship between her two complementary principles.[58] Elsewhere, in *hostage*, Foot invokes neither of these two principles to explain the moral impermissibility of killing. There, it is deemed impermissible because it is unjust, 'and if it is unjust the moral man says to himself that he cannot do it',[59] which seems to be an echo of Anscombe's earlier assertion about 'the superiority of the term "unjust" over the terms "morally right" and "morally wrong" '.[60] But, from the point of view of *VE*, a recourse to justice as the final arbiter seems to be little more than a fallback position; there is nothing in *VE* which says that justice is automatically an overriding virtue.[61]

I think that a number of salutary lessons can be learnt from the trajectory of Foot's thought here. First, the invocation of supplementary principles is obviously external to *VE*, and perhaps to be seen as involving an implicit acknowledgement of the emotion/action-guiding objection. To be sure, a virtue ethicist could say that it is a virtue to be guided by such principles. Somebody who never violates a negative duty for a positive one might then be said to possess the virtue 'negative over positive': to be 'negoposi'; however, contemporary virtue ethicists (Foot included) do not typically invoke such 'new' virtues, but rather seek to re-establish the traditional virtues as the basis of morality. Second, the principles Foot invokes, whether to dismiss or to uphold, all seem to be more or less 'dangling': of dubious

moral relevance, relative to descriptions, or mere articulations of faith (witness the final recourse to justice). Third, and most importantly, even if the principle of double effect and the negative–positive duty dichotomy were thought to have potential moral value, that value must lie in adjudicating between courses of *action* (in the ordinary sense), not between *emotions*. It simply has no meaning to say, in cases such as the one of my colleague's undeserved promotion, that being jealous is wrong and being happy-for right, or vice versa, because one emotion is 'intended' and the other 'merely foreseen', or because one is a violation of a negative duty ('non-interference') and the other merely of a positive one ('bringing aid') in Foot's sense. These labels may become applicable when we start to think of the *expression* of emotions, how we decide to act or refrain from acting upon them, but they are totally out of place when we ask the basic question concerning which emotion is the morally appropriate one to *feel* (a question about which *VE*, of all moral theories, should be able to provide guidance). For episodic emotions are obviously not chosen or 'intended' in the same way as actions,[62] and we are interested in the moral justification of an emotion such as my jealousy in the promotion case, although it may never be expressed and acted upon and hence never result in any 'interference'. Foot's two complementary principles are derived from the realm of actions and outcomes of actions, not from that of inner experiences. Given the way in which her constructions have dominated the relevant 'discursive field', we now realise why the typical *VE*-response here tends to be a response merely to an action-guiding objection, not an emotion/action-guiding one. Fourth, the very choice of examples biases the discussion towards the realm of actions, and pretty spectacular ones at that. By concentrating on scenarios in which no ordinary people will ever find themselves, and at the same time ignoring cases of emotional conflict (or, for that matter, the conflict of more everyday-like courses of action), *VE*'s problems of adjudication are systematically trivialised.

Let us now consider answers to the emotion/action-guiding objection that do not rest on supplementary principles but are rather *internal* to *VE*: which make use of the resources of that moral theory itself. Here we are much aided by Rosalind Hursthouse's recent attempts, in a series of inter-related essays, to come to *VE*'s rescue.[63] I shall be eliciting from her writings, and those of some of her fellow virtue ethicists, a number of manoeuvres that need to be scrutinised. Let me call them manoeuvres *(a)–(e)*:

(a) VE does guide emotion/action.   The idea here is that every virtue generates an instruction/prescription (be compassionate, happy-for; act courageously, justly, etc.), and every vice a prohibition (do not be spiteful; do not act cruelly).[64] The importance of this truth about the capacity of the virtues to guide emotion/action notwithstanding, to invoke it here seems merely question begging. The manoeuvre overstates the idea behind the

emotion/action-guiding objection: its point is not, as already noted, that the virtues are individually unable to guide action, but rather that they do not tell us by which virtue to abide in cases of conflict.

(b) Other moral theories do not fare better than VE here, or fare even worse. This partner-in-crime manoeuvre is typically invoked via some sub-claims of which I shall mention three:

(b1) At least VE does not try to make the difficult look easy, as for instance does utilitarianism. This manoeuvre rests on the assumption that knowing what to feel and do in a morally appropriate way is a 'difficult business', and that utilitarianism (and even deontological theories) tend to treat these difficulties with levity.[65] Hursthouse complains specifically about the lack of a 'moral remainder or residue' in utilitarianism: that lingering sense of regret or remorse a virtuous person continues to feel even after choosing the lesser of two evils.[66] Utilitarians, by contrast, allegedly act in their moral lives as if they do not care a whit about the 'eggs' that need to be broken to make the 'omelettes'. I am, however, at a loss to understand why utilitarians' reliance on a strict decision procedure implies that they cannot agonise afterwards about the choices they had to make. There is nothing in utilitarianism that could possibly refute Aristotle's truism that it 'is sometimes hard [...] to judge what [goods] should be chosen at the price of what [evils], and what [evils] should be endured at the price of what [goods]. And it is even harder to abide by our judgment, since the results we expect [when we endure] are usually painful'.[67] That utilitarians take their reflective emotions or actions – inspired by the principle of utility – to be morally right, and hence admirable, given the situations in which they find themselves, does not mean that they cannot regret that the situation did not present a better choice, or that it was not possible to bring about an even better outcome. Agony after a painful decision is not a special privilege of virtue ethicists.

(b2) Utilitarians will also encounter cases where there is nothing to choose morally between the competing options. It is quite true that for every moral theory there will be cases where both/all options are equally good/bad, so that it does not really make a moral difference which one we choose (for instance, which of two identical twins to pick when a doctor can save one of them but not both). However, as Daniel Statman notes, cases of this sort 'are so rare that they seem irrelevant'.[68] Indeed, this is acknowledged by Hursthouse, who refrains from invoking *(b2)* since 'the hard cases that figure in the debates are not, by and large, of these sorts'.[69]

(b3) The stories used to demonstrate VE's lack of emotion/action-guidance are too fantastical to be of any practical import. There may be valid doubts about the usefulness and the edificatory force of the current fad for

far-fetched moral examples. It may even be true that this fad has exerted a debilitating influence on much recent empirical work in moral psychology and moral education (see s. 6.2). However, when coming from virtue ethicists, this response seems like the throwing of a stone from a glass house, since most of the 'fantastical' stories have been devised by the virtue ethicists themselves in order to highlight the repugnancy of utilitarianism. Utilitarians would be the first to welcome a change of compass to more everyday-like situations.[70] Anyway, the example that I used earlier to introduce *VE*'s problem of emotion-guidance derives from common, rather than extraordinary, circumstances in the workplace.

(c) Many of the putative conflicts under discussion are merely apparent, resulting from a misapplication of virtue or vice terms. So, for example, what at first sight seems like a conflict between kindness and honesty, when considering whether to reveal a hurtful truth to a person, may resolve itself once we realise that one does the person no kindness by concealing this sort of truth from him.[71] Strict adherence to a doctrine of the intrinsic unity of the virtues would make this manoeuvre a compelling one. However, most contemporary virtue ethicists do not embrace that doctrine; Hursthouse for one does not, implicitly acceding that this manoeuvre is only of minor importance.[72] Hence, the appropriate response to *(c)* will be more or less the same as to *(b2)*: true but rare.

(d) So much the better! This is a bullet-biting manoeuvre par excellence. The fact that *VE* allows for comprehensible disagreement on many important issues of emotion and action is to be seen as a virtue, rather than as a vice, of the theory – that is, 'entirely to its credit'. Generally, to quote Hursthouse, 'we should make it a condition of adequacy on a theory that it can leave some cases *un*resolved'.[73] The reason why philosophers find this uncomfortable is, according to Hursthouse, simply that they are loath to admit that they are qua philosophers not 'fitted to say anything true or even enlightening on real moral issues'.[74] Here is a convenient excuse for scepticism and amoralism, a release from and transcendence of the human condition: there is nothing to say, from a philosophical perspective, about the moral conflicts confronting us! This manoeuvre has already been seized on with relish, for instance, in a recent paper arguing that there is 'no one single answer to the question, "Would a virtuous person refrain from committing adultery?" ' The author, Raja Halwani, claims, à la Hursthouse, that *VE* 'does not give us one formula for treating the issue', and this is seen as a 'positive aspect' of the theory.[75] Now, it is one thing to underline the essential difficulties in determining, from a moral point of view, what to feel and how to act; it is quite another to make a positive virtue of falling between two stools. Fortunately, Hursthouse has subsequently come to realise that her original claim was much too strong, and that 'an adequate

ethics should be sufficiently flexible to allow for a comprehensible disagreement on the question whether there are unresolvable dilemmas'.[76] Whether or not these are, in principle, unresolvable may not be the major issue, but rather that there are some dilemmas 'from which even a virtuous agent cannot emerge with her life unmarred'.[77] However, this is also easily accounted for by utilitarianism (see my response to *(b1)* above); and if the point is that our choice may at times be confined to equally bad or equally good options, then *(d)* will have collapsed into the rather insignificant *(b2)*.

(e) VE instructs us to ask what a virtuous agent would feel/zdo in the circumstances and take our cue from that.   Hursthouse emphasises that this is more than a 'trivial point', since 'it gives a straightforward explanation of an aspect of our moral life which should not be ignored, namely the fact that we do seek moral guidance from people who we think are morally better than ourselves'.[78] This suggestion, commonly invoked by virtue ethicists, evidently goes back to Aristotle's specification of a virtue as a state determined by reasons, by reference to which the idealised figure of the *phronimos* (the 'intelligent' person; the person of practical wisdom) would define it.[79] Now, simply pointing to Aristotle is of course a mere *argumentum ad verecundiam*. What does he mean and what are the credentials of what he is saying? Aristotle's *phronesis* entails the capacity to see what is conducive to the human good in particular situations and this, in turn, entails the capacity to know both what to feel and what to do. But the perennial question here is the *Euthypro*-type one:[80] are these standards for action and emotion morally appropriate only because the *phronimos* follows and enjoins them, or are they followed and enjoined by him because they are morally appropriate? Michael Slote, among others, has given a variety of reasons for ascribing the latter view to Aristotle.[81] The chief reason why I concur with Slote is that Aristotle clearly does not shrink from detailed discussions of moral conflicts and how they should be solved. Although 'it is not easy to define [such] matters exactly', 'we must try to offer help'.[82] And the 'help' does not consist merely in asking the *phronimos* what he would do and follow suit. Moreover, whatever Aristotle may or may not have thought, the former view invites well-known problems of intuitionism. There seems to be more to moral understanding, even if one happens to be a *phronimos*, than simply recognising what to feel and do through some symptoms provoked in one by the confronting situation – as in a terrier smelling a rat. Further, supposed cases of intuition guiding people along the right path in this or that field of life usually turn out, on closer inspection, to involve the systematic application of knowledge and experience. For example, popular folk theories in Iceland, about a small number of skippers blessed with the ability to locate and catch fish on the grounds of a mysterious 'hunch', have been decisively refuted. The 'skipper effect' turned out to depend upon other, more earthbound, factors.[83] My bet is that the '*phronimos* effect' does too.

There is a much more productive sense, however, of the invocation of the *phronimos* to be teased out of Aristotle and, indeed, of manoeuvre *(e)*: that is, the reference to the person of practical wisdom as an *educational exemplar* rather than as a *moral arbiter*. We must always bear in mind that Aristotle's target audience comprises people already 'brought up in fine habits',[84] people for whom the question 'Why be moral?' does not present a live option, and who are (or at least should be) eager to learn how to feel and what to do in order to lead a fulfilling life. In such a study plan, the first lessons naturally consist in watching people who are more competent than the student and modelling oneself on them.[85] The exemplar serves the educational function of awakening one to the truth; the ultimate aim is not to mimic him, or to do things just because he does them, but to learn to think like him: as soundly, as morally (see s. 6.3). Thus, the exemplar's superiority is not inherent and persistent, not a function of a special intuitive ability from which his emotions and actions flow, but rather contingent and provisional. We learn from him and follow him until we have caught up with him on the path of moral understanding: a path which is, in principle, open to each of us. These educational lessons are salient and cogent, but as part of a manoeuvre to rebut the emotion/action-guiding objection, they are question-begging, for mature persons may always have good reasons for second-guessing their teachers.

To retrace our steps, virtue ethicists typically respond to the emotion/action-guiding objection through manoeuvres either external or internal to *VE*. I sketched the supplementary principles discussed by Foot and found them to be of dubious moral value in adjudicating between actions. Others may deem them weightier there. That makes little difference, for the main point was that these principles, derived as they are from the sphere of actions and outcomes, essentially fail to guide our *emotions*. Only by steering clear of examples of emotional conflict are we able to present such principles as rescuing *VE*. The internal responses, while mostly question-begging or morally irrelevant, did inure *VE* to the objection under discussion in some cases. Various other cases, however, seemed to be left open.

But should its supposed failure to meet the emotion/action-guiding objection necessarily count as a sign of *VE*'s inadequacy as a moral theory? As has been richly documented in recent discussions of the *self-centredness objection*, one of *VE*'s chief assumptions concerns the primacy of *character* over particular acts and emotions. Why should a moral theory be found wanting and dismissed for failing to deliver goods that it never aspired to deliver, while its main advantage over other theories, that of accounting for the notion of a good moral character, is overlooked?

In response to this question the following answer is in order. If *VE* aims to confine its attention to virtues of character at the expense of particular acts and emotions, then it ignores the fact that the value of a virtue, qua disposition to act or feel, must be logically parasitic on the worthiness of the

acts and emotions to which the virtue tends to give rise. For in default of these acts and emotions, as Hugh Upton has convincingly argued, we would have no grounds for regarding the relevant virtue as a disposition at all; nor, therefore, as a good one.[86] Interestingly enough, there is never any question in the works of Aristotle – the grandfather, if not the father of *VE* – that being virtuous means doing something with it rather than sitting pretty on it. Well-being is an 'activity' rather than a 'state': for if it were not, someone might enjoy it and yet 'be asleep for his whole life, living the life of a plant'.[87] 'Olympic prizes are not for the finest and strongest, but for contestants, since it is only these who win; so also in life [only] the fine and good people who act correctly win the prize.'[88] There is no 'primacy of character' here; rather, the tree is known by its fruit. Being endowed with a good character is, for Aristotle, clearly not praiseworthy as such; what matters is how it is manifested through particular actions and emotions. One might even read him as saying that attributing 'good character' to a person who fails to exemplify it in his deeds is a *logical* mistake.[89]

We may conclude from this that an attempt to evaluate virtuous character independently of its manifestations is as futile – to take an example from politics – as to give an account of the nature and value of social freedom independently of the actions that agents are (actually or prospectively) free or not free to perform.[90] To continue with this comparison, there do exist various purely conceptual accounts of freedom, which are interesting both in themselves and as necessary preludes to substantive theories;[91] however, a full-blown normative theory of freedom will have to make room for quantitative as well as qualitative measurements of freedom and to weigh the substantive importance of different freedoms in different contexts.[92] Virtue ethicists do not typically present their theory as a mere conceptual account of what a virtue is; they present it as a substantive *rival* to deontological and utilitarian theories. But then they must be required to satisfy the same demands as these competing moral theories, and also (by comparison) as substantive theories of freedom: namely, they must have something important to say about particular cases.

It might still be urged that this answer does not go to the heart of the original question about the thrust of the emotion/action-guiding objection. Does this objection not from the very beginning load the dice against *VE* in general and Hursthouse's account in particular by assuming that the demand which tends to be made of moral theories, that they supply a comprehensive emotion/action guide, is a valid one? Is not the real point at issue between me and Hursthouse, a supposed interlocutor might ask, that I deem a moral theory inadequate unless it can fully specify how we should act or feel whereas she does not consider *VE*'s inability to provide such direction as a failure at all – that it is not a necessary condition for any presumptively adequate theory that it provides as much – in which case my complaints have simply begged the all-important question?

There are various reasons why I think that the interlocutor's question oversimplifies and misconstrues the point of disagreement. First, the claim that a moral theory need not guide action has never been insisted upon in practice by leading virtue ethicists. Recall that the point of Foot's additional moral principles was that with the help of such principles *VE* could and should guide action, even in as far-fetched cases as those sketched earlier. Recall also that Aristotle certainly thought it worthwhile to 'try to offer help', that is, moral guidance, in dilemma-situations (although I do not, any more than Hursthouse, propose an *argumentum ad verecundiam* with respect to Aristotle here). Second, as far as Hursthouse herself is concerned, she was reportedly drawn towards *VE* in the first place because of its ability to account for the moral salience of the emotions, and it is obvious from the thrust of her writing that 'moral salience' here means the ability to guide our emotions *in practice*, not only to account *in theory* for their moral significance. Third, it is not really true either that, while acknowledging the role of emotion-guidance, she still thinks that such guidance need not be 'comprehensive', for the very point of most of her manoeuvres was precisely that *VE does* guide action/emotion more clearly and comprehensively than the opponents of the theory tend to think. With the exception of the bullet-biting manoeuvre, which Hursthouse has already relinquished, her manoeuvres are all about how *VE* does not fare worse than competing theories with respect to the very demand of emotion/action guidance: that many of the putative conflicts are merely apparent, that we can and should listen to the advice of moral experts, etc.

In sum, Hursthouse's basic point is *not* that an adequate moral theory may with impunity fail to specify how we should act; nor does she think that there is anything special about emotions which makes their guidance, in principle, more difficult than that of actions. Quite the contrary, she takes it to be a chief virtue of *VE* that it can account for emotions no less than actions. My argument above was thus not question-begging with respect to the demand of comprehensive emotion/action guidance; rather, I argued that a demand which Hursthouse herself accepts is not really met by *VE*: that the combined efforts of all the internal manoeuvres do not suffice to meet it. Incidentally, Hursthouse and other virtue ethicists will no doubt reject the claim that a moral theory need *fully* specify how we should act/feel in every conceivable situation, but then, not even the strictest utilitarian will understand the demand for 'comprehensive guidance' from a moral theory to mean that it must yield a single determinate answer to every moral quandary, however far-fetched (see *(b2)* above).

To resume the earlier thread of argument, perhaps we should sympathetically conclude from the combined efforts of *VE*'s internal responses that the cases in which *VE* fails to guide our actions are, at least, less frequent than the action-guiding objectors think. Is it necessarily unreasonable to relegate the remaining 'hard cases' to the level of secondary moral importance: as

'tragic dilemmas' that should appear equally tragic, intractable, and agonising to followers of other moral theories, too,[93] and/or as dilemmas with which most ordinary people fortunately do not have to cope (witness the battery of fantastical examples)? If we are only thinking about *actions*, this may not seem so unreasonable. Fortunately, in the vast majority of cases, followers of different moral theories will – or so it could be argued – differ little, if at all, about what is the correct thing to *do*. For example, if my promoted colleague and friend in the earlier example is feeling really low for some personal reason, all mainstream moral theories will probably concur in advising me to comfort him. However, what should I *feel* about him deep down while doing so?

While reflective decisions about *actions* may tend to follow well-trodden paths, and only leave room for a limited number of tragic dilemmas, the same surely does not apply to conflicting *emotions*. In the former sort of cases, we are guided by all kinds of signposts and 'traffic lights' – social norms, contextual conventions, and practical considerations – and we often have some time at our disposal to consider what would be the correct way to act. In the latter sort of cases, social and contextual conventions offer much less help, while various disharmonious, intense, and unstable beliefs and concerns tend to pop and clatter like fireworks in our minds, demanding our immediate attention. Central to *VE*'s internal responses may, I suggest, be a failure to appreciate the *ubiquity of the tragic* in human life as embodied in the numerous hard emotion-cases which we encounter almost at every turn: questions of what is the morally appropriate way to *feel* in everyday situations – irrespective of what we, in the end, decide to *do* or refrain from doing. By avoiding common examples of mundane but tragic emotional conflict, and concentrating on far-fetched examples of morally competing actions, virtue ethicists are able to lessen the thrust of the standard action-guiding objection. But the force of an *emotion/action-guiding objection* lies exactly in such common examples. While Foot's supplementary principles seem to ignore the very existence of emotional conflicts, the internal responses implicitly underestimate the frequency and pervasiveness of such conflicts. However, if the emotion-part of the *emotion/action-guiding objection* cannot be rebutted, the value of *VE* seems to be more or less reduced to that of a spectator sport.

Now, it is quite true that even a strict decision procedure, such as the utilitarian one, would not be able to determine whether I should properly feel jealous of or happy for my colleague in the example as I sketched it above. Utilitarianism would require a much richer description of the facts of the situation in order to tell us how to solve that conflict, or even in order to guide us productively towards its solution. However, such context-dependent empirical facts are what utilitarianism thrives on, what the utilitarian decision procedure is all about. The problem is that, by contrast, even if such a rich description were forthcoming, there does not seem to be much that *VE*

could do with it. 'What should I feel?' is simply not a question that *VE* is fit to answer in cases of all the small conflicts and minor tragedies of everyday life, that is, when there is more than one potentially virtuous emotion on the moral menu.

What are we to make of all of this, then? If *VE* cannot satisfactorily guide our emotional life, perhaps it is not the moral theory for which we have been looking. Perhaps its appeal has been specious, or perhaps at least – as Hursthouse herself now frankly admits – the supposed link between a belief in the moral significance of the emotions and an adherence to *VE* was never more than an 'historical accident'.[94]

Is there a better theory at hand? The reader may be excused for thinking, given the above line of reasoning, that my answer will be *utilitarianism*. Indeed, I think that classical utilitarianism is an untapped source in our search for the moral justification of particular emotions (see the following section). For those less sympathetic to utilitarianism, however, let me suggest an alternative route for *VE*: namely, to stray less than it typically does from the teachings of Aristotle himself. Virtue ethicists commonly speak as if there is nothing special about other-concerning acts and emotions; the fact that some virtues directly benefit others seems to be viewed as a kind of happy but accidental feature of character traits which primarily enter into the well-being of the agent himself. After all, benevolence is 'only one of the virtues', as Foot states;[95] similarly, compassion is presumably only one of a set of virtuous emotions relevant to a given situation. In Aristotle, however, there is no hint of the thesis that each virtue is simply one among others of equal or incommensurable standing. By contrast, 'the greatest virtues are necessarily those most useful to others', for instance justice and courage, and even Aristotle's supreme virtue of *megalopsychia* (see s. 3.2) is so highly ranked because of its capacity to produce 'great benefits'.[96] Virtue ethicists would be well advised to concede the moral precedence of other-concerning elements in the virtues; that would also help to dispel some of the odour of sanctity surrounding their theory, which has, among other things, given rise to the objection of self-centredness. Such a concession would not require them to relinquish their deep-seated antipathy to maximisation,[97] nor commit them in advance to any particular view about how to adjudicate between competing other-directed concerns, but it would at least help them make a start towards their professed goal of doing justice to the moral salience of the emotions.

2.3 Utilitarian naturalism and the emotions: an untapped source

We have seen that virtue ethics is superior to liberalism and postmodernism in so far as it makes sense of our emotions and gives them pride of place in a well-rounded, moral life. At the same time, however, the basic weakness of

virtue ethics as a moral theory – its failure to arbitrate between potentially virtuous but conflicting actions and reactions – is nowhere more apparent than in the case of the emotions, both because of the pervasiveness of emotional conflict and the imperviousness of the emotions to the supplementary principles commonly invoked by virtue ethicists.

Is it possible that a sophisticated form of utilitarianism can retain the advantages of virtue ethics while circumventing its problems? Utilitarianism happens to be both a widely discussed and a widely misunderstood moral theory. This is not the place to correct all the misunderstandings that flourish in academic circles, and are perpetuated in journals and textbooks, about the nature of utilitarian reasoning. Let me simply rehearse some basic truths from John Stuart Mill's *locus classicus*, both to set the stage for the subsequent discussion, and to emphasise that the 'sophisticated form of utilitarianism' mentioned above refers to Mill's classical version of it. What interests me here, in a book about emotional justification and in the context of finding a corrective to virtue ethics, is the Millian type of value objectivism rather than those more recent forms of value subjectivism with which utilitarianism has unfortunately come to be connected and even equated. Thus, I have no truck with 'preference utilitarianism' which defines happiness as the satisfaction of actual subjective desires: a theory to which I shall momentarily return below.

Millian utilitarianism holds that 'actions are right in proportion as they tend to promote happiness, wrong as they tend to produce the reverse of happiness', and by 'happiness' is simply meant 'pleasure, and the absence of pain; by unhappiness, pain, and the deprivation of pleasure'. In other words, what powers the utilitarian engine and motivates one to act as a utilitarian is *hedonism*. However, it is a subtle form of hedonism which not only instructs us to take the long view, that is, to forgo short-term for long-term gain in pleasure, but also refuses to equate the correct hedonistic choice with what any given agent may think here and now will satisfy his desires: a doctrine which would truly be 'worthy only of swine'. For some kinds of pleasure happen to be objectively more desirable and valuable than others: 'Human beings have faculties more elevated than the animal appetites, and when once made conscious of them, do not regard anything as happiness which does not include their gratification.' Those competently acquainted with the cultivation of a higher quality (say the reading of classics, or the experience of profound personal love) will place it so far above the cultivation of a lower quality (such as the consumption of chocolate) that they will prefer the former, 'even though knowing it to be attended with a greater amount of discontent', and would not resign it for any quantity of the lower-order pleasure. Hence, Mill's oft-quoted remark: 'It is better to be a human being dissatisfied than a pig satisfied; better to be Socrates dissatisfied than a fool satisfied.' The verdict of the 'competent judges', who know both pleasure-levels from their own experiences, is an objectively valid one, although it is

derived from the human life-world rather than from any a priori, abstract reasoning. Mill further holds it to be psychologically true that nothing is desired by human beings which is not either a part of happiness or a means to happiness, and he also maintains that the only reasonable evidence we can give for something being desirable lies – as is the case with all other similar questions of fact and experience – in its *actually* being desired (by competent choosers). But why should we aim for the general happiness of mankind, 'the greatest happiness of the greatest number', rather than simply our own happiness? Again, Mill's reasons are entirely empirical: human beings are in fact generally so constituted as to be pleased by what is useful and pleasant to their fellows. Should a person lack this natural constitution, there are other valid motivations to maximise the general happiness: calculated prudence ('if I scratch their backs, they'll scratch mine'), or fear of blame and punishment.[98]

Now, there are obviously various empirical (especially psychological) facts about which one needs to agree with Mill in order to become a devout utilitarian. Evidently, however, the same applies to an adherence to any form of virtue ethics: such adherence presupposes factual beliefs about what is actually good for human beings, what makes people tick. Indeed, Mill has a lot to say about the virtues from his empirical standpoint; so much so in fact that his utilitarianism could reasonably be subtitled a 'virtue-based ethics'.[99] 'The utilitarian standard', Mill says, 'enjoins and requires the cultivation of the love of virtue up to the greatest strength possible, as being above all things important to the general happiness.' People should desire and cherish the virtues not only as means to happiness, but as part of their happiness: for not only does displaying the virtues bestow happiness upon others and thus tend to the 'multiplication of happiness', which is the ultimate object of virtue as of other human pursuits, but also developing and exhibiting the virtues is intensely gratifying for the agent himself, as competent judges can witness. Hence, cultivation of the virtues becomes the fundamental goal of moral education, to which the utmost care and attention must be devoted, not least the nourishment of the capacity for 'nobler feelings' which is such a 'tender plant', and easily killed in youth by want of sustenance.[100]

Mill would have agreed wholeheartedly with George Eliot who in her *Middlemarch* remarks that there is 'no general doctrine which is not capable of eating out morality if unchecked by the deep-seated habit of fellow-feeling with individual fellow-men'. The emotion of *compassion* acts here as the 'basic social emotion'[101] which fortunately comes naturally to most of us but can still be killed in childhood by lack of nurture and by hostile influences. As the emotional bridge between individuals, compassion constitutes a fundamental virtue for the utilitarian, and in many ways the very fulcrum around which a true utilitarian disposition revolves. However, it is not the *only* virtue: a person so overcome with compassion for the plight of convicts escaping from prison by climbing down a drainpipe that he decides to lend a

helping hand is not acting in accordance with the utilitarian spirit. Even if we add as condition to justified compassion, as Aristotle does to his specification of pity, that it rests on the belief that the suffering in question is not caused primarily by the victim's own culpable actions,[102] we are not yet on solid ground in giving unoverridable priority to compassion, for a person who seriously neglects his children and spouse because of intense compassion for the innocent victims of an avalanche in a nearby village may also fall short of the utilitarian standard. Furthermore, there may be cases where the virtue of *justice* (or simply that of honouring promises and other formal obligations) conflicts with that of compassion; recall that for Mill, requirements of justice stand collectively higher in the scale of utility than any others.[103]

The important point to note here is that none of the individual virtues of reaction and action are, in principle, unoverridable except the fundamental one encapsulated by the utilitarian principle of the maximisation of general long-run happiness. Generalised beneficence is the utilitarian virtue par excellence to which all the other virtues must remain subordinate. However, it cannot be exhibited over and above the other virtues; its role is more that of an arbitrator deciding when and in what proportion the other virtues should be displayed. There is a firm decision procedure at work here which helps utilitarians steer clear of the *emotion/action-guiding objection* to which virtue ethicists succumb.

The importance of a virtue, be it one of reaction or action, can lie in its directly benefiting others and ourselves, or in benefiting others without harming ourselves, or in benefiting ourselves without harming others, or in benefiting ourselves so as to be (more) capable in the long run of benefiting others and ourselves. A perfect utilitarian will never need to exhibit a virtue benefiting others while harming himself, for though he may need to choose a course of action painful to himself (even the ultimate one of sacrificing his own life for that of others), the pain he would experience by refraining from that course of action would outweigh the one induced by his choosing the sacrifice as the lesser of the two evils. Notice that although the original *motivation* behind a utilitarian frame of mind is a hedonistic one, the *objection of self-centredness* (s. 2.2) does not hit at utilitarianism, as the utilitarian virtues are essentially other-directed: concerned with benefiting or at least not harming others. The notion of acting for beneficiaries rather than oneself is not, as in modern-day virtue ethics, a fringe benefit of one's own character training. Performing one's duties towards others is the crucial thing. Moreover, keeping the original hedonistic motivation constantly in mind would be counter-productive from the utilitarian perspective, in the same way as asking oneself every morning what one could do today to achieve the most pleasure would be self-defeating – it would undermine pleasure rather than increase it. It is better simply to carry on with one's virtuous activities.

At the centre of the utilitarian virtues is, as we have seen, the emotion of

compassion. Needless to say, all the other emotions will play their roles as virtues in so far as they are necessary ingredients in and/or conducive to happiness. The requirements of the utilitarian principle clearly encompass all states of affairs for which agents can be morally responsible, be those states of experience, character traits, or direct actions. Why, then, is it frequently charged that utilitarianism fails to take account of the moral significance of the emotions? Perhaps another of the 'historical accidents'[104] to which Hursthouse refers is here to blame. It is true that when Mill introduces his principle of utility, he formulates it in terms of right actions, not right emotions. Moreover, in his *Utilitarianism* and indeed in the whole of his corpus, the emotions are rarely mentioned directly. However, it may be helpful to bear in mind that Mill was notoriously reluctant to duplicate the work of his friends and colleagues. In one place in his *Utilitarianism*, he cites approvingly the 'elaborate and profound work' done by his friend and biographer Alexander Bain on the ethical emotions.[105] Bain had given reasons in the work to which Mill refers for classifying the emotions with the higher senses and provided an extensive account of their moral dimensions.[106] In another work Bain wrote: 'Our several Emotions or Passions may co-operate with Prudence and with Sympathy in a way to make both the one and the other more efficacious', and he particularly singled out anger or resentment as a moral sentiment which 'heightens the feeling of reprobation against wrong-doers'.[107] Bain's orientation is echoed in Mill's description of how the sentiment of justice, which in itself 'has nothing moral in it', stemming as it does partly from a 'natural feeling of retaliation or vengeance', becomes moral once it has been subordinated to considerations of the general happiness.[108] In other words, morally fitting emotions will form a part of utilitarian moral reasoning. We need to do more than to concede, as Hursthouse does, that it would not involve any 'immediate inconsistency' for utilitarians to add on to their doctrine how 'optimific' it would be for people's emotions to be morally justified;[109] it would indeed be inconsistent for them *not* to include potentially alterable states of affairs, such as our emotional reactions, in their calculations. Quite apart from this general truth is the fact, already highlighted, that a central virtue in utilitarianism, compassion, happens to be an emotion.

Perhaps Mill thought that his friend Bain had said what needed to be said about the 'ethical emotions'. Whatever the reasons are for his reticence, they should not be seen as revealing any overt or covert utilitarian under-appreciation of the moral significance of emotions. Indeed, utilitarianism with its single standard of moral justification seems better fitted than most other moral theories to fend off any illusions of the emotions as intruders in the moral realm. Despite the demise of non-cognitive theories of emotions, such illusions still linger on and are even perpetuated to some extent in Ben-Ze'ev's book, where the personal, limited, and non-intellectual perspective of the emotions is often contrasted with the detached, objective perspective

of intellectual, rational thinking.[110] Utilitarianism is particularly adverse to the thought, commonly implied by such a dichotomy, of 'intellectual' moral reasoning being a case of letting one's head rule one's heart. For utilitarians, without the heart there is no morality. With beliefs – perhaps more often than not *rational* beliefs – forming a central part of emotions, there is no question of subordinating those automatically to beliefs from some more 'intellectual' perspective. All our beliefs, in so far as they have a moral dimension, be they originally formed from a 'partial' or from a more 'detached' perspective, must in the end submit to the same authority, namely, the test of conduciveness to the general happiness. That test requires that we be prepared to feel our thoughts and think our feelings.

Someone might object, however, that although utilitarianism pays heed to the moral significance of the emotions, it does so in the wrong way by subjecting this significance to the principle of utility. Are there not morally justified emotions which have nothing to do with the production of the general happiness, not even the happiness of the person experiencing them? Oakley takes as an example the experience of grief at the passing of those close to us. Does lack of grief in such circumstances not indicate a moral defect, even in cases where it does not have the utility of showing others that we commiserate with them, or of assisting us psychologically in coming to terms with our own bereavement?[111] The simple utilitarian answer to this question will be that it is contingently true that people cannot be utility-maximisers without feeling grief in those circumstances. If they do not experience the emotion, there is something missing in their emotional repertoire which characterises kind and compassionate persons. Feeling the appropriate grief is thus both indicative, and conducive to the sustenance, of the kind of people who are likely to make this world a happier place. However, Oakley's complaint exemplifies a range of objections against utilitarianism based on considerations of what might theoretically be the case if people were different from what they happen to be. Would it not be better, from the utilitarian standpoint, if people could continue to be utility-maximisers without experiencing the kind of grief Oakley describes? I shall try to bring out the irrelevance of such 'other-worldly' considerations to the utilitarian enterprise later in this section.

Before that, a few words must be said in passing about two standard textbook objections which tend to be levelled against utilitarianism, at least in so far as these might seem to undermine the standing of the theory as an account of the moral significance and justification of emotions. The first of these, all too often invoked to demonstrate the repugnancy of utilitarianism, rests on the alleged *problem of victimisation*: there are no categorical prohibitions in utilitarianism preventing the sacrifice of the interests (and even the lives) of innocent people to serve the needs of the 'greatest happiness of the greatest number'. A utilitarian must thus be ready to stoop to anything to fulfil the obligations of his theory, even to the killing of the innocent patient

in the *transplant*-story (s. 2.2) in order to save the lives of five others. Utilitarians typically retort that such killings will not in fact tend to the overall happiness of mankind because of the precedent they will set and the fear created for others who might end up in the same shoes; only in far-fetched science-fiction examples will victimising the innocent really be utility-maximising. In the context of the emotions, the anti-utilitarian objection might be that if a person's desires could be intensively enough gratified through the experience of a negative emotion, such as *Schadenfreude*, so as to outweigh the grievous plight of the victims whose suffering is being gloated over, then *Schadenfreude* would be morally justified on utilitarian grounds. More than that, it might even be beneficial overall to create new circumstances of undeserved suffering in order to satisfy the pleasure of the malicious observer. Theoretically this may be true, but in the real world the intensity of people's pains and pleasures seems to be pretty equally distributed. It is impossible to think of an actual situation where the outcome of the utilitarian calculation would in fact be the emotional victimisation envisaged in this example, especially if we take into account the precedent it would set to others. To be sure, there could exist a world, half made up of sadists and half made up of masochists where the best utilitarian state of affairs involved the constant torture of the latter by the former, but that is far from being the world that we real human beings inhabit. In *our* world as it *really* is, the most perfect utilitarian is likely to be much less trigger-happy, much more queasy, and much more ready to put his foot down, than the critics seem to think. Why such an answer cuts less ice with them than it should is another story, which I shall briefly explore later in this section.

Another common reason for rejecting utilitarianism lies in the alleged *problem of detachment*: we, as normal people, are driven forward by certain ground projects, based on deep-seated emotional attachments to specific persons and causes which happen to be so important that they virtually decide whether life for us has any meaning. Utilitarianism allegedly requires us to give up these projects if they conflict with what we are obliged to do as utility-maximisers. But that is psychologically absurd because without these projects we lack any motivational basis; we have no reason to feel and act at all.[112] Let us say that a man is 'driven forward' by deep love for his wife; she happens to be dying as a result of a serious accident and asks her husband to hold her in his arms. According to this criticism, however, he as a conscientious utilitarian would be required to abandon her: 'Tough luck, my dear, but I've got to attend to five other victims of the accident whose lives I could possibly save while you're passing away'. The cold voice of utilitarian calculations fails – objectors will claim – to honour the truth that for a system of morality to work, various forms of emotional selectivity have to be deemed permissible and even encouraged; any viable moral theory must thus make room for the kind of personal commitments and blood-is-thicker-than-water assumptions against which utilitarianism requires us to steel our hearts.

But does utilitarianism really make such a 'psychologically absurd' demand? What should be noted first is that utilitarianism is not the likeliest of moral theories to make such psychologically absurd demands of people; asking people to act or feel in ways which grind them down as human beings, and deprive them of any reason for living at all, is not likely to be utility-producing in the end. Utilitarians have long acknowledged the justification of special care based on deep personal friendships and ties of consanguinity: human beings are in fact so constituted as to be able to form deep personal ties with only a limited number of people, and those reasonably expecting to be specially treated will suffer more acutely than others if we neglect them. Additionally, we are able to promote the happiness of our friends and relatives less haphazardly than that of others in so far as we know them better,[113] and finally, but no less importantly, it may well be that people who are not imbued at an early age with the spirit of personal attachments will later be unable to comprehend the needs of those at a distance – witness the soulless Gradgrinds in Dickens's story.

Selectivity in emotions and actions on grounds of special attachments had been psychologically explained by Alexander Bain two years before Mill published his *Utilitarianism*: 'The love fire subsisting in the mind by nature bursts out on the choice of some one object, and is best sustained upon one.'[114] These psychological insights are given a moral grounding by Mill who says that a person 'would be more likely to be blamed than applauded for giving his family and friends no superiority [...] over strangers, when he could do so without violating any other duty'; and he firmly states that both 'genuine private affections' and a 'sincere interest in the public good' are possible 'to every rightly brought up human being'.[115] The right balance between those may, of course, in practice be difficult to strike. However, it is a pure travesty of utilitarianism to claim that the man in the above example shall *ex hypothesi*, cool as a cucumber, neglect the last wish of his beloved dying wife to attend to the needs of the other victims. First of all, no decent person would listen to the demands of such a heartless moral theory (which would deprive it of any potential utility); second, the person who left his wife in such circumstances would probably either end up committing suicide afterwards or be(come) so spineless and emotionally detached as to pose a threat to his neighbours. Even if that were not the case, we simply do not wish to live in a world where such decisions are taken by 'kind-hearted' people, and, thus, there are good utilitarian reasons for not taking them.

Still, although the foes of utilitarianism might possibly agree with the conclusion reached about this particular case, they would dislike the argument which supports it. They would grumble – as has been done in various recent articles about utilitarians' inability to form real friendships – that the attachments and commitments to which utilitarianism may give pride of place are still but 'instrumental friendships', incompatible with the emotions and practical requirements of real 'end friendships'.[116] The problem is said

to be that for utilitarians any friendship is in principle relinquishable, should the total consequences of honouring it be outweighed by some other relevant considerations. What utilitarians fail to accept, then, is the *intrinsic*, as opposed to the *instrumental*, value of deep affections. Now if this means that utilitarians cannot conceive of the value of attachments as part of their happiness, rather than as a means to it, then that contradicts Mill's very own specification of happiness, as we have already seen. However, if what is meant is that there might always be cases where the utilitarian would consider himself required to sacrifice the value of a friendship, or even the friend himself (should the latter, for example, be infected with a deadly virus from outer space threatening the future of mankind), then that is theoretically true.[117] But no true friend would make the demand of us, for example, that we neglect the cries of a child drowning in a pond outside of our window on grounds of the intense pleasure of engaging in a conversation with him, let alone that we should rather see the world go under, than sacrifice his life. Such demands would not be demands of friendship, or even deep personal love, but rather of desperate, mindless obsession.

Anti-utilitarians seem to find something impure about the very possibility that utilitarians will, in times of urgency, balance their commitments towards their family and friends against the harm which they could prevent by abandoning them. But the question is whether by abandoning the possibility of calculations about best states of affairs we shall not substitute the 'utility machine' with a much more repellent apparatus. Good people should not wear blinders, narrowing their moral vision. Fortunately, the occasions for the sacrifice of deep affections on utilitarian grounds will be extremely rare; I do not think it would be called for at all in the husband–wife scenario above. However, to reject out of hand the possibility of interpersonal calculations of utility when our friends are at stake may, in the end, lead to a much more serious psychological disharmony than that of which utilitarians are accused. For if it is morally better to act out of 'pure' friendship rather than friendship which is in principle revisable, then it must be better to act spontaneously out of such 'pure' friendship rather than out of the sense or the theory that it is better to act out of such friendship.[118] Hence, in the end, the 'pure'-attachment demand not only excludes the possibility of utilitarian calculations, but of all rational, moral considerations whatsoever, leaving us only with the intuitive reliance on our 'moral nose'. Given the accumulated experience of mankind, with people relying in their actions and reactions on their strongest moral intuitions 'feeling true', I would suppose that the reader now understands what I mean by a 'more repellent apparatus' than utilitarianism.

The above considerations show, I believe, how utilitarianism emerges more or less unscathed from the two standard objections. A closer look at specific richly illustrated examples may be needed to check whether utilitarianism really passes muster in all conceivable 'this-worldly' scenarios, but at

least no good reasons have presented themselves to undermine its potential value as a foundation for the justification of emotions. The demand that a morally justified emotion is one which makes our world a better place in the long run seems to be an admirable springboard from which to launch an exploration of the moral worth of particular emotions, and I shall make such use of it in the sequel. For me, the appeal of utilitarianism here lies in its retaining the best of Aristotle's insights into the salience of the emotions while averting the mess created by modern-day virtue ethics. The basic lessons to be learnt from the present and the preceding sections are that, when we consider the emotions, the objections levelled at modern virtue ethics hit their mark while the ones aimed at utilitarianism do not.

There are, indeed, striking similarities between Aristotle's and Mill's conceptions of happiness, which partly explain the compatibility of utilitarian considerations of the emotions to an Aristotelian approach. These similarities tend to be explained away in the literature as superficial or, at best, mentioned as an example of Mill's indebtedness to Aristotle from whose anti-hedonism Mill, however, unhappily departed. Yet, surprisingly, I have not come across any book-length, or even a thorough article-length, study of the exact relationship between their respective ideas of happiness. Clearly, for Aristotle, no one can enjoy happiness (*eudaimonia*), that is, flourish as a human being, without also experiencing pleasure, for 'happiness' is at once 'best, finest, and most pleasant'. Actions expressing virtue are particularly pleasant in this way. The pleasure derived from them is 'not to be added [to virtuous activity] as some sort of ornament; rather, it has its pleasure within itself'.[119] Hence, he who lives well necessarily enjoys the activities which make him flourish. Pleasure 'completes' his activities 'like the bloom on youths'.[120]

Although these remarks are well known and often quoted, Aristotle's distance from utilitarianism tends to be highlighted through his slighting dismissal of pleasure as the end of human pursuit, being fitting only as an end 'for grazing animals'.[121] However, if we look more closely at what Aristotle says about pleasure, and especially why he refuses to equate the life of pleasure with the good life, those with classical utilitarian sympathies will find little to complain about. Aristotle points out that 'the things that please most people conflict, because they are not pleasant by nature, whereas the things that please lovers of what is fine', in particular actions expressing virtue, 'are pleasant in this [natural] way'.[122] He later suggests that 'perhaps pleasures differ in species'; for those derived from fine sources, such as the praise bestowed upon us by a true friend, are different from those of shameful origin, such as the praise of a flatterer.[123] Now, this sounds suspiciously similar to Mill's qualitative distinction between higher- and lower-level pleasures, mentioned above, and Mill's claim that indiscriminately seeking the gratification of all pleasures was 'worthy only of swine'.

It might still be objected that Aristotle's conception of *eudaimonia* as the

end of human life is radically different from Mill's in that Aristotle never conceded that an ingredient of well-being, for example a virtuous emotion, is ultimately chosen *for the sake of* pleasure. Although both conceive of 'happiness' as an inclusive end, Mill's hedonistic spur to engaging in 'truly pleasant' activities would thus be alien to Aristotle. Far be it from me to make a hedonist out of Aristotle.[124] However, notice that questions of motivation are not, in general, given much attention in Aristotle's ethical writings. We should not forget that his readership comprises people brought up in good habits, people who have already decided (or at least should have decided) that they want to be good. Aristotle does not need to gild what for them is already a lily. Mill cannot and does not take such motivation for granted: the hedonistic rewards are the carrots he offers to those who are ready to make an experiment with living a life of virtue. The eventual reason why even a sceptic can be persuaded to want to achieve *eudaimonia* in Aristotle's sense will, for Mill, be the fact that nothing makes life more joyful. Pleasure, fecund and deep, is the ultimate motive behind the choices of any rational human being, and, given our common human nature, it so happens that steadily aiming at individual betterment along Aristotelian lines yields more pleasures of that sort than any fleeting fancies.

The point of this brief comparison of Aristotle and Mill is that, while they approach the question of the good life from, so to speak, different angles, the recipe they offer us is basically the same. Although I have chosen utilitarianism as the theoretical framework within which I want to defend particular emotions, it would thus, I think, make little difference in practice if I had opted for a 'pure' form of Aristotelianism – as distinct from modern-day virtue ethics – instead. To capture the essential spirit of both these theoretical frameworks in one sentence, we could say, as Susan Wolf does in a stimulating essay, that 'meaningful lives are lives of active engagement in projects of worth'. The recognition that 'meaningful activity and self-interest cannot psychologically stretch too far apart' brings us to the realisation that a meaningful experience, be it of an action or an emotion, only arises when the 'subjective attraction', on which Mill concentrated, meets the 'objective attractiveness' which both he and Aristotle emphasised.[125] My reasons for siding with utilitarianism here are educational, in a practical sense, more than strictly philosophical: for utilitarianism provides us with the carrots needed to convince even those not already brought up in fine and noble ways that exhibiting morally justifiable emotions matters for them, an issue to which I shall return in section 6.2.

Before I finish this discussion, two final observations are in order. First, nothing in what I have said undermines criticisms that writers of broadly Aristotelian sympathies commonly direct at more modern versions of utilitarianism. For instance, Nussbaum does well to remind us of the fact, frequently emphasised by Aristotle himself, that 'desire is a malleable and unreliable guide to the human good', and that if we aim at the satisfaction

of the desires people happen, as things are, to have, our decisions will frequently succeed only in shoring up the status quo. The kind of subjective preference utilitarianism dominating much of contemporary economic and political debate is thus correctly described by Nussbaum as a 'prominent opponent' of Aristotelianism.[126] However, my point has been that preference utilitarianism provides a lean counterpart of utilitarianism proper, in Mill's sense, and that we have no reason to be stuck with the former.

Second, there is of course a difference between Aristotle and Mill in that Aristotle is not a utility-maximiser. The main reason for that lies in his *elitism*: his belief that only a small group of men (as opposed to women, slaves, etc.) are capable of reaching true happiness. Hence, there is no worldly reason for him to champion the general maximisation of happiness in human society. However, modern followers of Aristotle tend to dismiss his elitism as resting on factual, rather than theoretical, errors, and I shall follow suit. Once we acknowledge that every human being is, in principle, both capable and worthy of leading the good life, the idea of maximisation is bound to get a more sympathetic hearing than Aristotle would have given it in his day.

Having announced that my preferred method in justifying emotions is a utilitarian one, there still remains something to be said about the nature and scope of such a method. Let me here, towards the end of this section, focus on a feature of a utilitarian moral justification that it shares with various other theories, such as Aristotelianism and contemporary virtue ethics, namely, its uncompromising *naturalism*. What is the scope of utilitarianism qua naturalistic strategy, and why do so many philosophers look down their noses at such a strategy?

Naturalism, in general, maintains that answers to moral questions are to be derived from the world in which we live, in particular from human psychology, sociology, and biology. This means, among other things, that evaluative concepts must be constructed out of empirical non-evaluative ones, but as we saw from Anscombe's grocer example (s. 1.3), such a demand does not present any serious problems. In the kind of naturalism under discussion, human nature becomes the starting point of morality, not as an external metaphysical (or even biological) fixed point, but as a humanly experienced context for human lives – recall Nussbaum's reconstruction of Aristotelian naturalism (s. 2.1). The role of morality is to co-ordinate the (often) conflicting interests of human beings in a world of scarce resources – our world, that is, not some other world – and to help real people achieve real happiness. There is no transcendence, no other-worldliness, no 'view from nowhere' at work here, but moral 'objectivity' is grounded instead in common facts about man and his world. This is what Nussbaum calls 'empirical' or 'internalist essentialism'.[127] The idea is not of giving up something more tangible that we had before and being left with an abyss, for though 'we get rid of the hope of a transcendent metaphysical grounding for

our evaluative judgments […] we have everything that we always had all along: the exchange of reasons and arguments by human beings', reasons 'that are historical and human but not the worse for that'.[128] We can easily imagine a world in which these reasons do not hold, since the facts on which they are based are only contingently true, but that world is not ours to live in.[129] The essence of 'internalist essentialism' has perhaps never been more lucidly captured than in Hilary Putnam's explication of his 'realism with a human face':

> Rather than looking with suspicion at the claim that some value judgments are reasonable and some are unreasonable, or some views are true and some false, or some words refer and some do not, I am concerned with bringing us back precisely to these claims, which we do, after all, constantly make in our daily lives. Accepting the 'manifest image', the *Lebenswelt*, the world as we actually experience it, demands of us who have (for better or for worse) been philosophically trained that we […] regain […] our sense of the common (for that some ideas are 'unreasonable' is, after all, a *common* fact – it is only the weird notions of 'objectivity' and 'subjectivity' that we have acquired from Ontology and Epistemology that make us unfit to dwell in the common).[130]

Yet, many philosophers are reluctant to take up Putnam's challenge of 'dwelling in the common'. They seem to feel that if we justify our actions and emotions solely in terms of how human beings and their environment happen to be constituted, the heavenly alchemy is missing: the immensity, the categorical force. An old Chinese fable tells of a man in the State of Zheng who wanted to buy himself a pair of shoes. He measured his feet, but then forgetfully left the measurements on his seat and headed off for the market. When he got there, he found out that he did not have his size sheet with him. He went back home to get it, but when he returned, business had ended and he could not buy any shoes. Asked why he simply did not try out the shoes on his feet, he retorted: 'I would rather believe in my measurements than my own feet.' Unfortunately, many academics, even of the most practical bent, are more willing to believe in measurements, preferably worked out by 'pure reason' and applying to all 'rational beings', than their own feet.

Not only is there a wide-ranging suspicion of naturalism in philosophical circles, many writers fail or refuse to understand what a naturalistic strategy involves. Thus, many common misinterpretations of utilitarianism seem to be based on deep-seated misapprehensions of, and insensitivity to, its naturalistic foundation. For instance, it is often claimed that Mill is somehow inconsistent in his hedonism, or not a true hedonist, since he maintained that the value of higher pleasures is 'intrinsically' greater than that of the

lower pleasures, so that no quantity of the latter could ever outweigh the value of the former – whereas a consistent hedonist should say that the value of no source of pleasure is intrinsically higher than that of any other but simply proportional to the amount of pleasurable experiences associated with it.[131] What is forgotten here is that 'intrinsically' means, for the robust empiricist Mill, nothing more than *as a matter of fact always*. Even more outrageous are claims such as the one that since utilitarianism 'puts no constraints on paternalistic action in principle', the utilitarian world 'tends to look like a realm of children'.[132] Although this is true *in principle*, and may apply in some other possible world, it has absolutely no relevance in our world: a world for which no one has incidentally produced a more convincing anti-paternalistic argument than Mill himself, claiming that *in practice* an area of private action can be cordoned off where certain paternalistic and moralistic interventions are always, in fact, outweighed by anti-paternalistic considerations with higher utility.[133]

To take one more example, it has recently been claimed that utilitarianism constitutes 'too feeble a basis' for the equal treatment of women: 'If the continued subordination of women produced more happiness than emancipation, then utilitarianism would yield the result that continued subordination was morally preferable.'[134] The 'if' is the great stumbling block here: how could anyone imagine that *in our world* oppressing half of the inhabitants for reasons of gender could possibly produce more happiness than not doing so? This is a mere theoretical possibility which, for the naturalist, has no practical application, no moral significance. But notice the trend of all these examples: our own 'feet' are too feeble a basis for buying shoes; we need some abstract 'measurements' instead. However, in looking for profundity, what we most likely end up with is vacuity. At least, we shall never be able to buy a decent pair of shoes.

It is, as we have already seen, de rigueur in philosophical writings to envisage some counterfactuals or possible worlds and ask: 'What if our world looked like this?' 'What would have happened had Aristotle become a shoemaker instead of a philosopher?' is indeed an interesting question. But the same does not apply to: 'What would have happened if Aristotle had only been born with reason and no desires?' He *could* not have been born in such a condition and still remained the human being Aristotle. We must not forget truths about man qua natural being when toying with counterfactuals.

I once tried, in a short essay, to give a specific example of how naturalistic reasoning can *actually* tell us what to feel and how to act. I chose my example from a topic often discussed at the dinner table: sexual conduct. Can an analysis of the nature of an emotion such as (erotic) love[135] guide us satisfactorily in our evaluation of casual sex? In the essay, I first indicated a line of defence for Anscombe's well-known claim that promiscuity *can* make people 'shallow'.[136] Whether it actually *does* (as she, of course, also claims) is, however, basically a factual question. There is absolutely nothing odd

about that, for it is inherent in the naturalist strategy that all normative ethics must be answerable to empirical research on human nature. Trying to construct a serviceable moral theory without recourse to human psychology and biology must be considered as fruitless as trying to build a fish-friendly aquarium without taking notice of the biology of fish. What I then, subsequently, set out to do was to produce plausible psychological and anecdotal evidence for the claim that the one-dimensionality of ships-in-the-night liaisons *in fact* undermines people's capacity for experiencing the emotion of genuine love.[137]

An example such as this one may give people a taste of what a naturalistic moral argument looks like, by showing how certain facts about the nature of a (highly-important) human emotion can, for instance, give us a good reason for modifying our desires and behaviour in significant ways. Generally speaking, rather than ignoring what the natural and social sciences tell us about human beings, or inventing their preferred psychology from scratch, philosophers would do well to pay heed to empirical evidence, scientific or even anecdotal. If my arguments in this section hold water, a project such as that undertaken in the present book, of justifying particular emotions through naturalistic utilitarian reasoning, will thus not incidentally but necessarily be interdisciplinary.

3

SOMETHING TO BE PROUD OF

The nature and conditions of moral and emotional excellence

3.1 Personhood, integrity, and self-respect

After having spent considerable time unravelling the credentials of different moral theories in accounting for the morality of emotions, the reader will now be expecting a justification of pride and jealousy from the utilitarian perspective adopted. Indeed, that is an expectation which I plan to fulfil, first for pride and subsequently for jealousy. However, a few more intermediary steps are still required as preludes, steps which have to do with *moral context*: It is a fruitless endeavour to try to defend particular emotions *in vacuo*. Exhibiting a single defensible emotion in a life otherwise characterised by moral indifference or turpitude has little if any moral relevance. It is only within the context of a life of moral and emotional excellence (whether as a reality, or – perhaps more typically – as an ideal at which the individual aims) that different attitudes, desires, and emotions acquire suitably clear and coherent roles to become objects of general moral appraisal. An art critic does not judge the appropriateness of individual colours on the painter's canvass; he judges them in so far as they tend to or detract from the unity and the overall impression of the given work of art.

In this chapter, I start by making some observations about the necessary conditions of moral and emotional excellence. The present section explores the nature of personhood, integrity, and self-respect. Section 3.2 then describes one notable ideal of such excellence: Aristotle's *megalopsychia*. I do not necessarily mean to recommend every aspect of this ideal to the reader. However, it brings to light certain elements of the good life with which I find myself in agreement and which I intend to use as a foundation on which to build my defence of pride and jealousy.

These intermediary steps concern what we could call the *substantive* moral context of my argumentation. However, there is also a *conceptual* moral context at issue here: the concept of pridefulness is, for example, located within a nexus of interrelated concepts, ranging from integrity and self-respect, to honour and dignity. For clarity's sake, there is every reason to keep those distinct, as far as possible. Thus, I argue in section 3.3 along the

naturalistic lines suggested earlier (s. 1.3) for the most profitable specifica-
tions of pridefulness and some of its related concepts. That is necessary
both for the general reason that one's bricklaying will never be better than
one's bricks, and the more specific one that 'pridefulness' is not a frequently
used word, if it figures at all, in most people's functional vocabularies.

For an individual human being to be a possible object of moral appraisal
in the first place, he must be capable of moral judgement. More specifically,
he must have the capacity to make practical, reasoned choices: to listen to
reasons, look for reasons, deliberate upon reasons, and make rational deci-
sions when confronted by a range of options. I shall call this capacity the
capacity for *personhood*. In addition to the capacity for reasoned choices,
personhood also implies a vision of oneself as a distinct person, an indi-
vidual whose choices are essentially – in nature and significance – on a par
with those of others but are still profoundly one's own. Although the term
'personhood' may have some controversial connotations, it is at least apt in
so far as we refuse to call anyone a 'person' who does not have the capacity
(potentially or actually) for practical reason. Incidentally, I think that a
thorough analysis would show this capacity to be a sufficient condition of
human personhood: a human being does not need to possess anything else
in order to be properly considered a person. This is not the place to argue
that point; if someone is unwilling to reserve the term 'personhood' for the
capacity in question, as I do in the sequel, and prefers a more technical
term, 'autarchy' may, for example, do nicely. Indeed, 'autarchy' has the
special advantage of reminding us of the difference between the capacity for
practical reason and its actualisation, that is, between 'autarchy' and
'autonomy'. For autarchy only sets a minimal standard; the autarchic indi-
vidual must be *capable* of taking autonomous decisions, whether this
capacity is necessarily *utilised* for extended periods or not; perhaps, in some
areas of life, it never is. Or as I would put it: A *person* does not need to make
autonomous choices all the time to remain one.[1]

My four-year-old son possesses personhood in that he can reach reasoned
decisions about various aspects of his life, for instance, which toys to play
with in particular contexts with particular persons. He is on the whole, at
present, however, quite far from being a suitable candidate for moral and
emotional excellence, and even lacks some characteristics necessary for
general moral appraisal. The biggest handicap is that while he has in a
certain sense 'a mind of his own', his decisions lack unity and coherence.
One cannot even rely on their transitivity: although he prefers toy *T1* to toy
T2 and *T2* to *T3* at a given time, it is not certain that he prefers *T1* to *T3* at
the same time. (If I complain that his choices do not mesh, he simply retorts:
'I don't want them to mesh!') My son can, so to speak, get his *act* but not his
acts together. He lacks integrity – fortunately, not a serious ailment at such
an early age – and in many ways behaves like a 'wanton': his decisions,
however rational in themselves, tend to be taken in isolation from other deci-

sions past or future, not to mention any 'second-order volitions' about what he should want to want.[2] An extreme example of an adult 'wanton' is Zelig in Woody Allen's film: the human chameleon who even acquired the physical characteristics of the people with whom he happened to identify at any given time in his life.

I understand *integrity* primarily as a psychological condition rather than a moral one: we are unwilling to consider people's decisions as 'truly their own' unless they form part of a (more or less) coherent set of decisions reflecting their real concerns. A person of integrity looks backward and forward, and the procedure by which decisions are reached, as well as the decisions themselves, fall into some sort of a line; display some sort of a (predictable) unity. While this does not require that the agent always act in the same way with respect to the same or similar objects and people, we expect to find some explanation of such differences, in a person of integrity, when looking at the details of the entire choice situation. The unity required for integrity could, however, be the unity of a villain just as well as that of a saint; such a psychological condition does not place any limits on moral content. Ordinary language commonly assumes that a person of integrity must uphold certain moral virtues, such as fairness and truthfulness, but I think it is more useful to retain here the narrower sense of integrity in which the requirement is merely a procedural and a formal one.[3]

To continue our ascent of the conditions of moral and emotional excellence, let us next consider *self-respect*. In an age which speaks so easily of relative values, there seems to prevail a surprising consensus on self-respect being one of the chief ingredients of a life worth living. Thus, philosophers of every stripe and persuasion close ranks in celebrating it as a virtue and/or a character trait to which pride of place should be given in our lives. For once, in philosophy, there seems to be a use for the old saying: 'Like motherhood, we are all for it.' Although self-respect is so widely, and undoubtedly rightly, taken to be an important value, there seems at first glance to be little agreement in the literature on the necessary and sufficient conditions for self-respect, and on its relation to other concepts and values.[4] Thus, we have various overly *narrow* analyses in which self-respect is explained without the barest acknowledgement of other related concepts, including its sister concept: *self-esteem*. We also see a number of overly *broad* accounts in which the extensions of terms such as 'self-esteem', 'honour', 'pride', 'dignity', and even 'integrity' are promiscuously run together under the rubric of 'self-respect', making the latter term bloated beyond good sense. This apparent disarray gives us a reason to attend to self-respect in some detail, and to that end I would like to start again with a personal story.

A few years ago, I was asked to give a number of talks at meetings of teachers' and parents' societies in Iceland about the importance of students' self-image for their educational achievement. I took 'self-image' to refer to self-respect *plus* self-esteem. However, not having at that time delved into the

philosophical literature on these concepts, I had to rely solely on my 'pre-theoretical' intuitions. I tried to recollect my own experiences as a teacher at various levels of the school system, from primary school to university, in so far as they related to this topic. And additionally, I was reminded of a science fiction story I had once read about a sadistic host who systematically humiliates guests at his cocktail parties. Gaining, with the help of an alien, control over the guests' souls, he makes them do things which they would otherwise never have done. Surprised that it is not yet his turn to be picked on, the narrator in the story is told that he is an 'immune': a creature who cannot suffer any such humiliation because there is nothing he would not do anyway, in real life. The upshot of the story was that the narrator is completely devoid of self-respect and, hence, morality.

Holding this story in view, I suggested to my audience a simple test of one's self-respect: ask yourself what you would never do for all the tea in China, starting with the (hopefully) obvious things such as killing your own child or selling your grandmother into slavery.[5] Extend the list, and the longer it is, the stronger your self-respect. In this sense, your *self-respect* encompasses your unshakeable commitments: the most important goals you set yourself in life and the moral principles by which you abide. We can, then, profitably view *self-esteem* as the level of one's own estimated successes in upholding those commitments. For illustrative purposes, I suggested that we think of self-respect as a *jar* – the larger it is, the stronger the self-respect – and self-esteem as *water* in the jar: the more water, the higher the rate of estimated successes. I then presented a simple model (see below) of the possible relations between self-respect and self-esteem: portraying four paradigmatic character types which should be familiar from the classroom, and giving them catchy names:[6]

		SELF-RESPECT (the 'jar')	
		Much	*Little*
SELF-ESTEEM (the 'water')	*Much*	The aristocrat	The servant
	Little	The whiner	The shit-eater

The *aristocrat* is a student who typically comes from a 'good family'; a student who follows clear rules and principles, does what is required with aplomb, and is self-satisfied. The aristocrat tends to excel in schoolwork and rule the roost in the classroom. The *servant* does not set such high goals or follow clear principles, but often finds at least a temporary vocation in doing

the aristocrat's bidding. Being at the latter's beck and call, the servant's self-esteem is kept high by the praise received from the aristocrat for services provided. Other words to describe the servant might be 'complacent' and 'dependent'. To turn to the *whiner*, it may of course be the case that a person is ashamed and un-self-forgiving for the simple reason of having allowed some improper incursions upon his or her strong sense of self-respect. In a more typical classroom situation, however, the whiner is at least equal in accomplishments to the aristocrat, but is unhappy with the ratio between accomplishments and pretensions. Here, the jar leaks, or is too large in the first place: the result of standards too high for anyone to live up to (extreme perfectionism). Finally, the *shit-eater* typically comes from a 'broken home'. This person has never learnt to abide by moral rules and has weak aspirations, but however meagre these aspirations are, the shit-eater still falls short of them: here we have a small jar containing little water.

Most members of my audience seemed to be familiar with those character descriptions from their own classroom experiences, from pre-school upwards (and some also from their encounters in the workplace – these traits do not suddenly disappear upon leaving school!). Some of them noticed precisely those weaknesses in this, as well as in other, accounts of self-respect which will become apparent below, but the general reception indicated that my model did reasonable justice to people's intuitions. Unknowingly at the time, I had also availed myself of a deeply-entrenched way to make sense of our attitudes and emotions by way of conceptual *metaphors*, and hit upon a pretty common and appealing one: the 'container metaphor'.[7]

There is a lot of truth in Weber's dictum that academics tend to be as proprietary of their preferred vocabularies as of their toothbrushes. Thus, it seems to me in retrospect that much of the apparent diversity in recent accounts of self-respect can, on closer inspection, be ascribed to differences in terminology. For instance, Rawls's much-discussed treatment of 'self-respect' in *A Theory of Justice* basically focuses on people's favourable opinion of themselves, and hence on what I have above called 'self-esteem'.[8] Other writers gloss over the term 'self-esteem', but speak instead of two kinds of self-respect: on the one hand *conative* self-respect; on the other hand *estimative* or evaluative self-respect.[9] Their 'conative self-respect' corresponds largely to what I have called 'self-respect', and their 'estimative self-respect' to my 'self-esteem'. The reason for doing this may lie in the fact that in ordinary English it sounds odd, in certain contexts, to say that a man who thinks he has violated some fundamental commitment – perhaps through a momentary lapse of will – still *has* self-respect, witness the phrase 'I could never respect myself again if I did that'.[10] The way out of this linguistic impasse is then to say that his conative self-respect is intact although his estimative self-respect has been (temporarily) defiled. Not being as worried as these writers about the vagaries of ordinary language,

where 'loss of self-respect' sometimes signifies self-disesteem[11] as in the given example, I shall in what follows continue to talk simply about 'self-respect' where others might be tempted to modify it by 'conative', etc., and the same holds, *mutatis mutandis*, for my use of 'self-esteem'.

Now, if we defuse the terminological differences in this way, a remarkable concordance of opinion starts to emerge in the growing mountain of literature on these two concepts. Self-respect is a complex character trait involving a desire and a disposition 'not to behave in a manner unworthy of oneself' – that is, to shun behaviour that one views as 'contemptible, despicable and degrading'.[12] A person with a sense of self-respect 'identifies with a project, activity or status' which provides a standard of worthy conduct,[13] a line past which one does not go. The person is committed to the standard, confident that by and large they are the right commitments, and tries to live accordingly.[14] Self-respect thus requires that one develop and live by a set of such personal standards 'by which one is prepared to judge oneself even if they are not extended to others'.[15] By contrast, self-esteem is a merit-based favourable opinion of oneself, 'arising from the belief that one meets those standards that one believes one ought to meet'.[16] In other words, self-esteem 'is the judgment that one is living congruently with one's values and thus is or is becoming a kind of person it is worth being'.[17]

Notice that these references to the contemporary literature do nothing to invalidate the insights from the original pre-theoretical model. The only serious conflict which I have come across between recent sources and my original model relates to David Sachs's claim that the notion of an excess of self-respect is a perplexing one.[18] This would seem to contradict my earlier example of the perfectionist whiner whose standards are too high to live up to and who might be better off with pared down aspirations, relinquishing the unattainable. However, Sachs admits that this notion could be intelligible 'from one or another utilitarian perspective',[19] although that is not the general moral framework within which he is working. My preferred justification of the value of self-respect would, indeed, be a utilitarian one (see below), and such a justification readily accounts for the notion of excessive self-respect as one undermining a person's chances of leading a rewarding life: consider a case such as that of a perfectionist schoolgirl who does not dare write letters to her best friend, who is on an exchange programme in another country, for fear of making spelling errors. In such circumstances, part of the person's self-respect can truly be considered an encumbrance devoid of value, not only an item that, as Sachs puts it, 'may more or less *painfully* have to be sacrificed' while valuable in itself.[20] By failing to acknowledge this possibility, Sachs denies himself insights that are common from everyday life about a person's having to 'swallow' or 'pocket' his excessive self-respect. On the other hand, Sachs more plausibly argues later that a total absence of self-respect is hard, if not impossible, to imagine. Thus, even our 'shit-eater' will possess some measure of self-respect, however low and

pitiable: for any socialised human being, it will always be possible to locate companions in distress, and to conceive of an even worse state of degradation and deprivation.[21]

As noted earlier, self-respect is uncontroversially regarded a valuable moral goal. Moreover, few would want to deny that it is good for people to esteem their achievements in a realistic way – preferably of course a positive way after their own standards have truly been reached. To quote the psychologist Bain, an 'estimate of self that ended in nothing would be flat and unprofitable'.[22] What are the grounds for this univocal view? With the evils of allowing inroads upon one's self-respect – a danger against which perpetual vigil must be maintained – being a constant theme in world literature and folk psychology, it is not difficult to imagine why philosophers have thought self-respect to be of capital importance. Firstly, self-respect is commonly considered to have the *psychological* value of imparting in us the zest necessary to pursue our life plans, whatever they may be. Secondly, there is the celebrated *moral* value of self-respect as a guardian of the (other) virtues: as the column of true majesty in man which preserves moral character and contributes to the continuation of morality. Thirdly, self-respect is often considered as having an *educational* value, not only in keeping students' noses to the grindstone and persuading them not to let their talents lie fallow, but also in instructing them to stand up to unfair treatment and claim their proper due – for instance, when discriminated against, whether on grounds of race, gender, or simply by a teacher who happens to dislike them. Fourthly, let us not forget the value which has been given least space in philosophical journals: the *pragmatic* one of being more successful in life and better liked by one's peers by maintaining a proper sense of self-worth. In so far as self-respect fosters reliability and reliability is a cherished character trait, the self-respectful person is likely to be held in higher esteem than the mercurial one. Thus, we seem to care about people, in particular our closest friends and relatives, those on whom we rely, having some sort of ballast which is not subject to the play of chance and the wear of time; such 'ballast' is commonly referred to as 'self-respect'.

When ascending to a theoretical level, we are bound to encounter Kantian justifications of self-respect as a perfect duty to oneself, the breach of which signals a failure to acknowledge one's own moral rights. However, the tenor of my above remarks should suffice to indicate that for those of us with consequentialist leanings, a utilitarian line of justification will do the job perfectly well: showing à la Hume how a proper sense of self-respect will 'advance a man's fortune in the world', 'render him a more valuable member of society', 'qualify him for the entertainment of company' and 'increase his power of self-enjoyment'.[23] For if 'to lose one's self-respect is, in the end, to lose oneself',[24] then such a loss should be no less of an anathema to a consequentialist than to a deontologist. Indeed, a utilitarian will, as Geoffrey Scarre has shown, view self-respect both as a necessary

condition of happiness and a major source of it. Whatever contributes to making human beings flourish comes within the purview of utilitarianism; and if it is true, as it surely is, that to consider oneself worthless – to realise a hollowness at the core of one's life – is to be wretched, then there exists the strongest utilitarian reason possible for promoting self-respect.[25]

However, if we want to go so far as to consider a secure sense of self-respect to be tantamount to moral and emotional excellence, two important deficiencies appear, deficiencies that are visible in both the conceptual specifications of my 'pre-theoretical model' and in the scholarly accounts. To put the first one succinctly, we have so far spoken as if every kind of self-esteem is predicated upon self-respect. However, it seems possible to suggest various cases of self-disesteem which have nothing to do with the evaluation of one's self-respect.[26] I am here not so much thinking of cases where a person takes pride in a certain kind of self-disesteem – such as the literary buff who boasts about an inability to do simple mathematics – but rather cases where persons believe they have violated certain standards they have set for themselves, but without it affecting the appraisal of their self-respect: for instance, a person takes pride in being a dab hand at painting, but one day makes a mess of it; yet the evaluation of self-respect remains unscathed. One attempt to solve this problem might be to concede that 'self-esteem' – encompassing any attributes that one would be pleased to have or regret not having – is generally speaking a much wider notion than that specific kind of self-esteem which concerns our self-respect. The obvious recourse would then be to fall upon some term, such as 'estimative self-respect', to distinguish the latter cases of self-esteem from the former. However, this does not really resolve our problem, for the violation of any standard that we set ourselves seems *potentially* capable of affecting the evaluation of our self-respect, given that we consider it as one of our core commitments or aspirations: even failing to do a good job at painting one's house might count. The question remains: what *is* or *should be* the difference between those cases of self-disesteem which do, and those which do not, affect the level of water in our jar of self-respect? Invoking the term 'estimative self-respect', without further explanation, simply begs that question.

A second, related but even more serious, problem is this: according to the generally-accepted specification of self-respect above, the standards that one sets oneself need not necessarily relate to anything that others value. In other words, this specification does not impose any constraints, moral or otherwise, upon what counts subjectively as worthy conduct. In Milan Kundera's novel *Life is Elsewhere*, there is mention of a woman who finally wanted to be herself and could do so only in being insincere! Even more worryingly, Dillon's 'corrupt', 'amoral', and 'wicked' individuals, who devote themselves to the bad out of selfishness or plain turpitude,[27] would all fall under the heading of the 'aristocrat' in my original model, as long, that is, as they identified with their evil aspirations and viewed their achievements in

that respect favourably. They would have a large jar of self-respect with a lot of water in it. There is no use in trying to explain evil standards away as unrealistic in practice. One only needs to read a few classics of literature, for instance *The Brothers Karamazov*, to realise that a sense of worth that is ill-grounded or morally execrable can be as uplifting and empowering, and defended with equal fervour, as morally valid self-respect[28] – and the devil looks after his own.

Perhaps Massey is right in that there are two notions of self-respect abroad in the literature, a subjective one and an objective one – that is, of valuing oneself and of properly valuing oneself. But, as he also notes, philosophers have failed to face this distinction squarely and adequately.[29] While some have furtively smuggled objective moral standards into their conception of self-respect – which, if done without explaining what kind of standards are needed and why, is question-begging – most have relied upon the subjective conception familiar from our pre-theoretical model and the scholarly accounts cited above. Apt as this conception may be for various purposes, it leads, in the course of our discussion, to the paradoxical conclusion that promoting morally unworthy, but internally coherent and strongly held, convictions can be a proper moral goal. The traditional accounts of self-respect do furnish us with *necessary* conditions of moral and emotional excellence, but surely not with *sufficient* ones.

I have now examined three conditions of 'the good life' where each condition builds upon the previous one and includes it as an element. As I have specified it, *integrity* is, in a nutshell, *personhood* plus coherence; *self-respect*, in turn, is integrity plus goals, principles, and the concern that these be actualised and honoured. However, an analysis of these three conditions furnishes us, at best, with an incomplete, formal (non-substantive) account of moral and emotional excellence, as none of them places any moral constraints upon the agent. To flesh out this account, we must look to higher things.

3.2 Aristotle's *megalopsychia*

Historically speaking, the most famous account of the virtues which make up 'the good life' is that of Aristotle. His account is particularly pertinent in the course of the present discussion because of his already-mentioned insistence that our emotions, as well as our actions and dispositions to act, are to be seen as potentially virtuous or vicious. Nowhere in his corpus does Aristotle produce a definitive list of all the character traits that can count as moral virtues. For example, it is often not entirely clear whether the emotions discussed in his *Rhetoric* should be considered full-blown virtues or vices, or simply concomitants of other such traits, in particular of those listed as moral virtues and vices in the *Nicomachean Ethics*. The following list of the Aristotelian moral virtues qua 'golden

means' between the corresponding vices of deficiency and excess is not meant to be exhaustive. However, it comprises the ones described in the *Nicomachean Ethics* and two clear examples of specific emotion-virtues (righteous indignation and pity) from the *Rhetoric* – although I have had to correct Aristotle's formulations somewhat with these last two in order to make them more consistent with his usual architectonic (see further in s. 5.1). Notice that, for simplicity's sake, I have given 'appropriate' names to some of the traits Aristotle calls 'nameless', and that when Aristotle mentions more than one vice of excess or deficiency, I have chosen the most general or characteristic one.

Deficiency	Mean	Excess
Cowardice	Bravery	Rashness
Insensibility	Temperance	Intemperance
Ungenerosity	Generosity	Wastefulness
Niggardliness	Magnificence	Vulgarity
Pusillanimity	*Megalopsychia*	Vanity
Under-ambitiousness	Right Ambition	Over-ambitiousness
Inirascibility	Mildness (of temper)	Irascibility
Quarrelsomeness	Friendliness	Obsequiousness
Self-deprecation	Truthfulness (about oneself)	Boastfulness
Boorishness	Wit	Buffoonery
Indifference to injustice	Righteous Indignation	Begrudging spite
Callousness	Pity	Hypersensitivity

Regardless of precisely which traits shall count as individual virtues, it is pellucidly clear that in Aristotle's virtue theory the virtue of *megalopsychia*[30] occupies a central position, a fact which, interestingly enough, has rarely been acknowledged during the recent revival of Aristotelian virtue ethics. The most important characteristic of the *megalopsychos* – he who possesses the virtue of *megalopsychia* – is that he 'thinks himself worthy of great things and is really worthy of them'. True to his famous architectonic of virtue as a mean between two extremes, Aristotle presents the *megalopsychos* as striking the right balance between two other character types: the *vain*, 'who thinks he is worthy of great things when he is not', and the *pusillanimous*, 'who thinks he is worthy of less than he is worthy of'.[31] The conditions of this virtue, and its respective extremes, thus appear as *greatness* and *self-knowledge*, that is, on the one hand the merits of a person and on the other the person's estimate (realistic or not) of those merits.

But then two problems turn up in trying to fit *megalopsychia* into the usual architectonic. Aristotle is himself aware of the first problem when he says that the *megalopsychos* 'is at the extreme in so far as he makes great claims. But in so far as he makes them rightly, he is intermediate'. In other

words, *megalopsychia* only presents a mean if we view it from the standpoint of one of its two conditions, self-knowledge, and there it actually coincides with the fourth character type: the person who is temperate without *megalopsychia*, that is, a person who 'is worthy of little and thinks so'.[32] However, viewed from the standpoint of the other condition, greatness, *megalopsychia* is in a certain sense an extreme: you cannot go further on the greatness continuum than being great. So the virtue of *megalopsychia* is obviously not as simple as, say, that of bravery which fits snugly into the middle between rashness and cowardice. The other problem is that self-knowledge seems to be an *intellectual*, rather than a *moral*, virtue. However, *megalopsychia* is listed among the moral virtues, that is, as a mean of actions and passions.[33] Perhaps both these problems rest on the temptation to view *megalopsychia* as just another moral virtue. Although it is classified as such in the *Nicomachean Ethics*, Aristotle clearly points out its unique position as 'a sort of adornment of the virtues'. *Megalopsychia* is a higher-order virtue – a kind of summation – which makes the other virtues greater and 'does not arise without them'.[34] This is made even more obvious by the fact that I have so far been able to speak, in turn, of *megalopsychia* as a 'virtue' and a 'character type'. Thus, it should be of no surprise that it does not fit into exactly the same architectonic as the other, subordinate, virtues.

Before proceeding further, it might be helpful to present a model of the relations between *megalopsychia* and the other character types:

		GREATNESS	
		Worthy of much	*Worthy of little*
	Thinks himself worthy of much	The *megalopsychos*	The vain
SELF-KNOWLEDGE			
	Thinks himself worthy of little	The pusillanimous	The temperate without *megalopsychia*

So far, everything sounds clear, but the question now arises why some people are worthy of great things and others of small. Aristotle says that the *megalopsychos* 'has the right concern with honours and dishonours': we can call those the external criteria of greatness. However, plainly, gaining external respect is not a sufficient condition of greatness. The main point is that the honour be deserved, and deserved honour is only 'awarded to good people'. Hence, the true *megalopsychos* 'must be good', must possess 'greatness in each virtue'.[35] It is vital to keep in mind in the following that the *megalopsychos* cultivates all the other virtues to a fault: he is great because of his own moral greatness.

Since deserved honour is an external criterion of greatness, the *megalopsychos* is concerned about gaining his merited respect:

> And when he receives great honours from excellent people, he will be moderately pleased, thinking that he is getting what is proper to him, or even less. For there can be no honour worthy of complete virtue […] But if he is honoured by just anyone, or for something small, he will entirely disdain it; for that is not what he is worthy of. And similarly, he will disdain dishonour; for it will not be justly attached to him.[36]

From this passage, and others following it, we might be tempted to conclude that *megalopsychia* actually has three main components rather than just two. In addition to the above two conditions of greatness (which we now know means greatness of virtue) and self-knowledge, the *megalopsychos* is highly concerned with his own worthiness or respect, in his own eyes and in the eyes of others. This concern reverberates throughout all his attitudes and conduct and makes him exude a certain 'aura' which cannot simply be reduced to (although compatible with) the two main conditions of the virtue. Let me, for the sake of convenience, get a little ahead of my argument and identify this third component of *megalopsychia* as the emotion of *pridefulness*.[37] I shall say more about this emotion in section 3.3, but for the time being, the reader can simply consider 'pridefulness' an umbrella term for the features of the *megalopsychos*' concern with his worthiness mentioned above.

Why has Aristotle's crown of the virtues fallen into such desuetude and disrepute as to be almost unanimously condemned by Aristotelian scholars and moral philosophers alike?[38] One of the reasons lies in some specific remarks made later in Aristotle's discussion of *megalopsychia*, which many find distasteful, such as that the *megalopsychos* is 'inactive and lethargic except for some great honour and achievement', and that he is ashamed of having to receive benefits from others, thus returning 'more good than he has received; for in this way the original giver will be repaid, and will also have incurred a new debt to him'.[39] Holding these remarks in view, many people have been tempted to write the *megalopsychos* off as obsessed with honour, arrogant, ungrateful, inactive, unneighbourly, and unable to form deep friendships.[40] Howard Curzer has recently lessened the severity of such accusations by subjecting the apparently distasteful remarks to a more positive critical scrutiny in light of their textual context. Where all else fails, Curzer can and does correctly point out that any descriptions of the *megalopsychos*' attitudes or practices must remain subordinate to the central condition of his possessing all the (other) virtues.[41]

To take a brief look at the textual evidence against the most common charges, the *megalopsychos* is not *(a)* obsessed with honour, for if he were, he would not count as a *megalopsychos* in the first place, but rather belong to

the category of the vain who think they are worthy of great things when they are not. The *megalopsychos* does not 'even regard honour as the greatest good',[42] and he must possess the subordinate virtue of right ambition, which is explained in the *Nicomachean Ethics* next after *megalopsychia*: a virtue characterised precisely by the morally right concern with honour, contrary to the concern of the 'honour-lover'.[43] *Megalopsychia* is based upon complete virtue, but vanity and vainglory upon imitations, presumptions, and the advantages reaped from them. The *megalopsychos* is surely not *(b)* arrogant either, but *ex hypothesi* modest, in stark opposition to those who think 'they are superior to other people' and 'despise everyone else' – arrogant people being consigned to the category of the vain. Toward inferiors, an air of superiority is 'as vulgar as a display of strength against the weak',[44] Aristotle says. The *megalopsychos* admittedly despises some people, especially those who show 'wanton aggression', but that attitude is not one of arrogance but rather disdain based upon justified beliefs about their immoral behaviour.[45] The *megalopsychos* can hardly count as *(c)* ungrateful either. He is not unhappy about the benefits received from others when he is in need; what he is unhappy about is having been in need for those benefits. This is why he wants to erase the memories of such circumstances, rather than to nurse them, but notably only after he 'returns more good than he has received'.[46]

The *megalopsychos* is concerned with great achievements, but does this mean that he is generally *(d)* inactive? Not unless we assume, like Hardie does, that 'opportunities for spectacular action are rare'.[47] But given the present state of the world, where so much work needs to be done to make it a more habitable and happier place for human beings, there seems little reason to suppose that the *megalopsychos* is bound to spend most of his time in bed (see further in s. 4.3). Furthermore, it would be a strange characteristic of an *(e)* unneighbourly person to be, like the *megalopsychos*, ready to 'help eagerly' while asking 'for nothing, or hardly anything' from his neighbours.[48] Finally, the suggestion that the *megalopsychos* is *(f)* incapable of forming friendships seems absurd. Not only must he display the ordinary niceties of friendly, civil behaviour (as is called for by the virtue of friendliness), he must honour the value of deep friendship which is extolled elsewhere at great length by Aristotle as being 'most necessary for our life'.[49] Besides, in the very analysis of *megalopsychia* itself, Aristotle adamantly states that the *megalopsychos* 'cannot let anyone else, except a friend, determine his life'.[50] Can we ask for more from a real friend than to be ready, if necessary, to let us guide his life?

Although many of the specific misgivings hovering over Aristotle's account seem to be off target, there is, I believe, a deeper reason why people tend to be disturbed by his description of *megalopsychia*, as well as that of some other related virtues, such as magnificence. In particular, there are some elements in these descriptions which seem to contrast sharply with

what we could loosely label the 'modern moral outlook'. It may, in other words, be the totality of Aristotle's account and its general background assumptions, rather than any specific scattered remarks, which tend to repel modern sympathies. More precisely, I think that what disturbs modern readers about *megalopsychia* is, first and foremost, that general feature of the *megalopsychoi* which I have already referred to as the emotion of pridefulness. I return to this general feature, and its various manifestations, in the following section, and offer a detailed defence of it in chapter 4.

3.3 Pridefulness: pride and shame

In the preceding section, we noticed a specific feature of Aristotle's ideally virtuous character-type, the *megalopsychos*, a feature that I tentatively equated with the emotion of pridefulness. This emotion allegedly generates deep concern with the person's own worthiness, and makes him exude an aura of aesthetic grace. To secure a richer understanding of pridefulness, we need, once again, to disentangle a web of interrelated concepts. My aim here is neither to uncover the real meaning of 'pridefulness' which has been lying all the time hidden from view, nor to offer a stipulative, sleight-of-hand definition of the emotion, but rather (as explained in s. 1.3) to argue for serviceable specifications and fine-grained distinctions that do justice to our intuitions and help us make sense of the emotional landscape.

Let us start with *pride*. Pride, in its simplest and most commonly understood sense, is an emotion of self-satisfaction, arising from the belief that oneself, or someone else with whom one identifies, has achieved something that is worth achieving. For example, I myself or my children (whose accomplishments form part of my self-conception) have done well in a difficult exam, and that makes me proud. Pride, in this simple sense, differs from mere joy in that the former emotion attributes (some) responsibility for the achievement to the subject. If I have simply won a big lottery prize, I may be joyful but hardly proud unless the participation in the lottery involved some positive contribution on my part which influenced the result. However, there is nothing in the nature of pride itself which guarantees adherence to moral norms; one can be equally full of pride about an amoral, or immoral, achievement as a moral one, as long as it conforms with one's idea of self-worth.

It is important to distinguish between pride and *self-esteem*. Although my heart swells with pride after a particular achievement, my self-esteem may still be, on average, quite low, since that is a measure of my *overall* sense of achievement. Conversely, high self-esteem does not guarantee a constant flow of pride; our pride may still sink occasionally when we mess things up, although we are, in general, well pleased with the ratio of our accomplishments to our ambitions. Notice, furthermore, that a person who has a lot to be proud of, and regularly experiences a welling up of pride, would not, on

those grounds alone, be referred to as a 'proud person'. We would simply say that he is very pleased with himself, or, if we want to be more academic, that he has a lot of (well-earned) self-esteem, while the term 'proud person' is reserved for something rather different, as I explain soon.

We now see why the common translation of *megalopsychia* into English as 'pride' is not particularly apt.[51] People can be proud of non-moral attainments, whereas the *megalopsychos* is proud only of his good moral character and its results. Moreover, knowing that people are proud of their achievements does little to indicate the strength and endurance of their self-respect: that column of true majesty in the *megalopsychos*' character. For the latter reason, the translation of *megalopsychia* as 'dignity'[52] comes closer to the mark; it captures the self-respectful character of the *megalopsychos* and also his concern with honours, but it does not include the element of positive overall self-assessment which characterises the *megalopsychos*: a person may retain dignity even in the absence of 'moral luck' (s. 4.2), when the opportunities to be proud, therefore, happen to be few and far between.

Although both the suggested translations of *megalopsychia* are, in important respects, incomplete or misguided, they do offer some illumination of features of Aristotle's supreme virtue – illumination which I think can be articulated as follows: 'pride' does, in certain instances, denote not only actual self-satisfaction but general concern with such satisfaction, its conditions and appearances; 'dignity', similarly, brings to mind not only worthiness but also sensitivity to one's worthiness being somehow confirmed, attested to, or impugned. Thus, both terms close in on the component of *megalopsychia* which I have called 'pridefulness'. Sachs has pointed out that it can be categorically true that a person both takes pride in nothing whatever and yet 'has his pride', since there is, after all, a well-understood sense in which 'pride' refers exclusively to one's self-respect.[53] Sachs is right, and we shall return to precisely that sense later. However, I would like to add that there is another distinct sense of 'pride' at work when we say that a person, who is not (at the moment) proud of anything in particular, is yet a 'proud person'. In the locution 'proud person', 'pride' refers to something other than the person's self-respect (as specified in s. 3.1): namely, or so I maintain, to the person's pridefulness. If it is true that 'pride' has many distinct meanings in ordinary language, and that too much conceptual freight is heaped on it, some tidying up may be in order. In the following, I propose that we reserve the term 'pridefulness' for the sense of 'pride' in ordinary language which is brought out in the locution 'proud person', for example the sense in which it would be correct to say that the *megalopsychos*, in addition to being self-respectful, having a realistic evaluation of accomplishments, and being (episodically) proud of particular achievements, is also a 'proud person'. Let us meanwhile reserve the term 'simple pride' for the episodic emotion of self-satisfaction.

Pridefulness, as I propose to demarcate it, is most easily recognisable as a

dispositional emotion. Prideful persons are inclined to experience profound and frequent (simple) pride when living up to their own expectations and successfully achieving their goals, but also profound and frequent shame upon failing to do so. Thus, pridefulness incorporates the episodic emotions of simple pride and shame as acute signals of success or failure, and provides in itself a strong source of motivation: shame is the ultimate turn-off for the prideful person and must be avoided at all cost, whereas simple pride becomes a highly-prized end. Moreover, the prideful person is sensitive to the just recognition of accomplishments, feels entitled to obtain, without cavil, any deserved rewards, and will experience disappointment or indignation towards those who fail to show proper regard.[54] The constant concern with the inner and outer reinforcement of self-worthiness lends the prideful person precisely that aura of aesthetic grace which I have already mentioned as a feature of the *megalopsychos*.

When I speak of pridefulness as being most easily recognisable as a 'dispositional emotion', I have two distinct senses of 'dispositional' in mind. First, pridefulness disposes us to feel other emotions, such as simple pride and shame, frequently and intensely. Second, pridefulness is typically a character trait; a person will not normally experience and be moved by pridefulness unless that person is a prideful person. By contrast, someone who is not, for example, a jealous person, that is, who does not possess the character trait of being easily disposed to jealousy, can nonetheless experience pangs of jealousy in some (extreme) situations, and similarly the most inirascible and mellow person can be led to anger, for there are circumstances in which 'even a worm will turn'. I am not saying that experiencing pridefulness once or twice but never beforehand or never thereafter is psychologically, let alone logically, impossible, but it would count as both rare and rather peculiar. In spite of this twofold dispositional character, pridefulness is, I suggest, more than merely a name for the tendency to experience simple pride and shame – however strongly *associated* it is with such a tendency. Admittedly, the word 'pridefulness', and it corollary 'shamefulness', might sometimes be used simply to denote that tendency; however, the sense implicit in the locution 'proud person' is much wider, lending weight to the claim that pridefulness is a specific emotion, which can be experienced episodically, with its own unique characteristic beliefs and concerns. A prideful man *believes* that he should experience simple pride often but shame seldom (and ideally never). He also *believes* that he is entitled to due recognition of his achievements, and is deeply *concerned* about his opportunities for simple pride and the merited external recognition. When this is not forthcoming, he *feels* (episodically) bad; 'his pride is hurt', as we say – another example of a locution where ordinary language substitutes 'pridefulness' with the more familiar word 'pride' – and, conversely, when the recognition is forthcoming, 'his pride is satisfied'. Notice that this is more than saying that a person feels proud or ashamed over an achievement or failure (or over

an external response to such an achievement or failure). A non-prideful person may also experience those simple emotions: the distinctness of pridefulness lies in the episodic nature of the experience, that the prideful person, *in addition to* feeling ashamed over a failure, also feels 'hurt pride'.

Why not use 'self-respect' instead of 'pridefulness' here? Well, because having strong principles and high goals need not include that element of sensitivity to external recognition which characterises pridefulness, as I have described it, although it may be argued that pridefulness is *in fact* needed to maintain self-respect (see s. 4.1). 'Dignity' may, however, be well fitted to cover the extensions of both 'self-respect' and 'pridefulness'. To complicate matters, there is, nevertheless, as Sachs pointed out, a use of 'pride' abroad in everyday language where it refers distinctly to a person's self-respect; think of a locution such as 'his pride prevented him from doing such a vile thing'. Arguably, this is also the sense of 'pride' inherent in popular slogans such as 'Gay Pride' or 'Black Pride': members of marginalised groups begin to consider some of their own properties, previously despised, as valuable, as a source of self-respect – a source of goals and principles with which they positively identify – rather than as a source of self-disrespect.[55] However, this is not the same as saying that they become prideful.

The *term* 'pridefulness' is not exactly on everybody's lips. It exists as a term in English, but its connotations are not always entirely clear. Still, there definitely exists a *concept* of pridefulness as I have described it, although it is commonly captured through other locutions, such as 'the proud person', and 'hurt' or 'satisfied pride'. I think that if we scrutinise uses of the term 'pridefulness' in English, they may come fairly close to expressing the above-described emotion of pridefulness. At any rate, they may come close enough for us to argue that 'pridefulness' can usefully be refined so as to give this emotion an appropriately inclusive name – without thereby severing the link to any features that 'pridefulness' in ordinary language tends to convey before the refinement. This is not to deny the fact that 'prideful' and 'pridefulness' are cumbersome expressions which must, in an analysis of a common emotion, be invoked somewhat apologetically. Another option would have been to distinguish from the start between three typical senses of 'pride', calling them 'pride$_1$', 'pride$_2$', and 'pride$_3$', where 'pride$_1$' referred to pride as the emotion of self-satisfaction over an achievement (what I have called 'simple pride'), 'pride$_2$' to pride as self-respect, and 'pride$_3$' to that particular dispositional and episodic emotional sensitivity to inner and outer recognition of achievement that I have termed 'pridefulness'. However, given that 'pridefulness' is at least a term that exists in English, talking about 'pride$_3$' would, I think, be considerably more awkward.

Ben-Ze'ev includes pridefulness in his list of emotions; he defines it, however, as a global emotion 'resulting from the belief that one is a good person', related to but distinct from pride which rests on the belief that one has, in specific cases, 'done a good thing'.[56] While there is some connection

between our respective uses of 'pridefulness', and how it relates to simple pride, there are also differences in scope and focus. For me, pridefulness need not necessarily be (although it perhaps ideally should, as in the *megalopsychos*) restricted to concern with goodness. Furthermore, I take pridefulness to include proclivity not only to simple pride but also to other episodic emotions concerned with our own and other people's evaluations of our deeds and status. It is difficult to say whether that specification or Ben-Ze'ev's is 'more correct' since both are critically invoked to serve a purpose rather than simply discovered, and adducing evidence from ordinary language for the superiority of my proposal will not settle the issue. However, I would argue that there is at least more urgent need for my 'tidying-up' work than for Ben-Ze'ev's. We could, without trouble, refer to 'pridefulness' in his sense as 'high self-esteem'; the dispositional emotion that I have described, however, has no obvious candidate for expression in our language other than 'pride' in one of its many and easily conflated senses.

In addition to simple pride, *shame* is the emotion to which pridefulness will most easily give rise – when and if called for. Ben-Ze'ev thinks of shame as the opposite of pridefulness and understands it as a global emotion where one considers oneself to be a bad person.[57] I, however, take shame to be felt when we negatively evaluate some action or aspect of ourselves, in the light of norms that we accept or of a standard that we want to live up to. In other words, when experiencing shame, we believe that we have violated some criteria furnished by our self-respect. So far is it from being true that pridefulness is the opposite of shame that the former will frequently imply and occasion the latter – unless, that is, one can be saintly and omnisciently 'wise at all times'. Robert Frost once wrote that if 'one by one we counted people out / For the least sin, it wouldn't take us long / To get so we had no one left to live with'. Similarly, if every bout of shame meant that we evaluated ourselves negatively overall, then it would not take long until we had nothing left to live for. Ben-Ze'ev's 'global shame' is better described as 'general self-disesteem' than as 'shame' in the ordinary sense.

There is a common distinction, and not a negligible one, between shame and *guilt*. The invocation of a sharp distinction between 'shame societies' and 'guilt societies' is, for instance, a commonplace in the social sciences where the former is supposedly characterised by *heteronomy*: avoidance of wrongful action for fear of being found out and ridiculed by others, the reaction of running or hiding away, if caught, while the latter is characterised by *autonomy*: avoidance caused by one's own sense of guilt, the reaction of self-loathing and of wanting to compensate one's victims, should one have fallen into temptation.[58] The idea seems to be that in shame one's assessment of failure is merely external, whereas in guilt it is purely internal, that is, only concerned with the subject's own norms and evaluations without regard for the verdict of a detached observer or the gaze of an

external audience. It is initially tempting to consider guilt an independent emotion – one focused on the individual's own moral failure which has caused harm and is thought to stand in need of rectification – and it is certainly possible to envisage people experiencing some sort of shame which does not involve guilt. However, the *conceptual* allure of the Kantian distinction between autonomy and heteronomy, reflected in the above guilt–shame dichotomy, has recently been waning. Furthermore, a close *empirical* look at actual uses of the term 'shame', even in paradigmatic 'shame societies', reveals that the emotion of shame is, indeed, taken to include guilt as a sub-class. I shall return to both these points in section 4.1. In the meantime, let me state, without further argument, that I think guilt can be viewed more productively as a special kind of shame rather than as its contrary. The statement 'I felt more guilty than ashamed' would then not be taken to mean that shame was not felt, but that its focus was more on those elements which accompany guilt (moral breach, direct harm, reparation) than on other common elements of shame – in the same way as the statement 'it tasted more creamy than milky' is not to be understood as a rejection of the fact that cream is also a milk product. Nevertheless, there is an important distinction to be drawn between cream and *other* milk products.

The preceding discussion should help us to negotiate a way out of the common controversy over whether shame is primarily related to one's self-respect or to one's self-esteem. In favour of the former connection is, for example, that fact that the Greek word *aidos* can be translated both as 'shame' and 'self-respect'. G. Taylor claims that there is a case for linking shame with self-respect,[59] and J. Kekes goes so far as to state that 'in feeling shame, we feel the loss of self-respect'.[60] D. Sachs opts for the other course by equating shame with a certain kind of self-disesteem.[61] My analysis above of shame helps us to solve, or rather to dissolve, this dispute by suggesting that while shame presupposes self-respect (for else there would be nothing to be ashamed about), and is in that sense linked to it, the experience of shame signals the presence and persistence, rather than the loss, of self-respect. The link between shame and self-esteem, on the other hand, consists in shame being a specific instance of that kind of negative self-evaluation for which self-disesteem is the global manifestation. Shame, if pervasive and frequent enough, will, thus, issue in (global) self-disesteem. However, another subtle point to be observed is that there evidently exists a contingent, psychological link between shame and self-disesteem on the one hand, and self-respect on the other, in that if a person has a lot to be ashamed about, or sinks into a generalised state of self-disesteem, he may be tempted to lower his standards accordingly rather than to raise his level of effort. In such a case, then, shame can constitute a warning signal that not only the person's self-esteem but also his self-respect is in jeopardy, just as fever can eventually start to endanger rather than to preserve a patient's health.

Prideful persons will normally, in the course of their lives, experience numerous instances of simple pride and shame. A person who does not possess this emotion dispositionally, or possesses it to a lesser degree than the *megalopsychos*, may of course still feel simple pride and shame, but will do so less intensely and less often. Even when there is little to be proud of, the prideful person may take pride in the fact that his or her self-respect is at least still undefiled.[62] In light of this analysis of pridefulness, it may come as a surprise to see Aristotle denying the claim that shame is a virtue. Given that he considers *megalopsychia* the supreme virtue, and that *megalopsychia* includes pridefulness as an element, as I have pointed out, one would have expected Aristotle to say that the ability to experience shame, when appropriate, is a sign that the *megalopsychos*' virtuous moral principles are intact. Taylor's observation that 'avoidance of shame is one way of losing self-respect, for it is one way of blurring the values the person is committed to'[63] seems, at first sight, to have a distinctively Aristotelian flavour. However, Aristotle adamantly states that no one 'would praise an older person for readiness to feel disgrace, since we think it wrong of him to do any action that causes a feeling of disgrace'.[64] Part of the explanation lies, once again, in the audience at which Aristotle's moral teachings are aimed: well-brought up virtuous persons. He does, by contrast, consider shame 'suitable for youth', where it has an educative function to fulfil, for the young 'often go astray, but are restrained by shame'.[65] There is no contradiction between Aristotle's description of *megalopsychia* and his rejection of shame as a virtue for adults, but he probably over-estimates the way in which even a *megalopsychos* can be wise at all times and immune to mistakes, and under-estimates the way in which a virtuous person can maintain fortitude and self-respect in the face of an occasional minor slip from the path of the right which requires a thimbleful of shame as a corrective. Once the topic of the moral justification of pridefulness and its emotional concomitants is broached, however, my conceptual clarifications and refinements have reached an end, and with it the time has come for a shift of emphasis.

4

IN DEFENCE OF
PRIDEFULNESS

4.1 The value of pridefulness

To recapitulate, section 3.1 testified to a broad academic consensus on the value of self-respect as a condition of the good life. The striking similarities between the model of self-respect versus self-esteem presented there and Aristotle's historical account of greatness and self-knowledge subsequently sketched in section 3.2 – including the self-explanatory parallels between the respective character types – will not have escaped the reader's notice. The excursion into ancient territory thus brings home to us that philosophers were dealing with issues relating to self-respect and self-esteem long before these two terms officially entered the philosophical vocabulary in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries.

Of even greater interest should be the fact that, however similar Aristotle's model is to the contemporary one, the former does not seem to be marred by the same defects as the latter. Now, if the older model includes all the essential elements of the younger, without the latter's defects, a tempting suggestion might be simply to skip modern accounts of self-respect in favour of Aristotle's account of *megalopsychia*. However, let us make do here with the weaker claim that considerable strength can be added to modern conceptions of self-respect by supplementing them with insights from Aristotle's model.

What do I mean by saying that the older model, when compared with the contemporary one, is not marred by 'the same defects'? Recall the two major shortcomings of modern accounts of self-respect and self-esteem (the terminological disarray aside). First, these accounts do not distinguish between that kind of self-disesteem which does and that which does not affect the evaluation of the extent to which we are living up to the demands of our self-respect. Second, these accounts are neutral as to the moral value of the commitments protected by our self-respect. To start with the second shortcoming, this is ameliorated in Aristotle's model by insisting that 'greatness' means 'moral greatness' and that the *megalopsychos* must possess all the virtues. Correspondingly, for self-respect to live up to its promise and count

as a moral value, we must demand that a person respect himself for the proper reasons. Simply possessing a large jar of commitments does not suffice as those commitments can be at odds with moral virtue. Furthermore, to consider the first shortcoming, the emphasis in our historical model on deserved honour and dishonour as criteria of greatness helps us realise that the only kind of self-disesteem which has relevance for the evaluation of how well we live up to our self-respect is that which involves *shame*, and that shame is properly felt only when a person has allowed inroads upon those commitments which have moral worth. In this way, the experience of shame becomes an important warning signal that one's moral values are under threat, which carries with it the practical implication that fostering receptivity to properly felt shame can be an important educational goal.[1] That Aristotle should have declined this implication, except for the young (s. 3.4), must simply be seen as one of his (infamous) empirical errors – in this case the psychological error of failing to accept the fact that no man is wise at all times.

Let me say something here about my choice of Aristotle for an account of moral and emotional excellence: an account meant to bridge the gap between formal and substantive conditions of moral appraisal. For one thing, Aristotle's moral outlook is 'in fashion' at the moment, though that fashion is highly selective and elaborated. For example, while the current preoccupation with virtue ethics is commonly spoken of as a revival of an Aristotelian or, more generally, an ancient moral outlook, most modern virtue theorists seem to think that considerable progress has been made in our understanding of human flourishing since Aristotle. Thus, their classifications and substantive accounts of the virtues are often strikingly different from those of the *Nicomachean Ethics*. Aristotle's crown of the virtues, *megalopsychia*, hardly gets a mention, and when it does, as we saw, it is emphatically rejected. Some kind of moral progressivism seems to serve as a backdrop here: while interesting in themselves, moral codes from bygone cultures, such as the Greek polity, will fail to appeal to moderns.

Quite recently, however, a number of philosophers have challenged this progressivism and advanced a case for a purer form of ancient morality[2] as a viable option in the modern moral arena. These 'purists' claim that 'when we think most rigorously and realistically' – or when we distinguish 'what we think from what we think that we think' – our deepest moral convictions are not so different from the ancients. Moreover, if and when these happen to clash, the morality of the ancients may simply be 'in better condition'.[3] As against that, other philosophers have objected that there still exists a wide gulf between ancient morality and our modern moral outlook, impregnated as the latter is with Christian and Kantian values even in those who claim to have no truck with either Christian or Kantian ethics. Hence, endorsing a pure Aristotelian conception of the virtues may require a more radical abandonment of modern morality than the purists have given us to believe.[4] Such

sceptical voices are undoubtedly right in that embracing ancient morality amounts to more than ridding ourselves of a few embarrassing delusions about what we think that we think. Nevertheless, the purists have achieved their primary goal of elevating a moral tradition from its previous status as an item of mere historical interest to that of a serious contender for our allegiance: an outlook to be judged on its own merits here and now, by reflective moral agents, as superior or inferior to its rivals.

While I have elsewhere tried to do the same for 'saga morality', namely, to liberate it from a state of moral mummification,[5] justifying all the details of ancient or medieval moral perspectives is outside the purview of the present book. There are certain aspects of Aristotle's moral account that I view with suspicion.[6] Perhaps also his account fails to fit the modern state or other factual conditions of modernity – those remain matters for further investigation. Even more importantly, there may exist contemporary moral perspectives that also conceive of morality as being social, secular, and naturalistic, that can do everything we expect from ancient morality equally well or even better. Indeed, I have already argued for a sophisticated form of utilitarianism as my preferred moral account (s. 2.3).

However, there is a reason why I think that the invocation of Aristotle's account is particularly apt in the course of our discussion of moral and emotional excellence. His account suggests that the emotion of *pridefulness*, analysed in section 3.3, is a necessary component of such excellence. I agree. And although my reasons for agreement may be slightly different from those of Aristotle, his account provides a valuable source of evidence – philosophical, psychological, and anecdotal – for the viability of this claim. More specifically, it can help us to counter the standard 'modern' objections to pridefulness as a potentially virtuous emotion.

The remaining part of this section presents some of the positive arguments for pridefulness as a virtue (or an ingredient in virtue), as well as coming to grips with the objection that the prideful person illicitly considers *shame* a proper motivation for action and emotion, while more advanced moderns only accept *guilt* as a motivation in such cases. Sections 4.2–4.4 then explore and respond to three other common objections, namely, that pridefulness falsely presupposes the ideas that: *(a)* moral greatness may be dependent upon external resources and personal luck (s. 4.2); *(b)* extraordinary or heroic deeds are more worthy of pride than the ordinary deeds of daily life (s. 4.3); and *(c)* people are not morally equal; thus, rejecting in an unacceptable manner the (Christian) virtue of humility (s. 4.4). To prevent any misunderstanding, let me make it clear at once that when I speak of pridefulness in the following, I am referring to that emotion as (potentially) experienced by a virtuous person – a *megalopsychos*, if you like. My question is whether pridefulness is a necessary component in the good life to which such a person aspires. Thus, my focus is on people who, like Mr Darcy in *Pride and Prejudice*, are said to have no 'improper pride'. I am not rejecting

the possibility that pridefulness can be a feature of a villain – certainly a villain can be motivated by simple pride and shame and concerned with recognition.[7] For a description of an 'aura of aesthetic grace' in an evil person, as well as of the peculiar beauty (aesthetic as opposed to moral) and fascination of evil emotions and deeds, let me remind the reader again of *The Brothers Karamazov*, or for that matter the *Godfather* film trilogy. Such a possibility does not contradict the claim that pridefulness can be a virtue; as with other emotions, pridefulness will only count as virtuous when it is morally appropriate – that is, when it is felt with respect to the right things at the right times. That is why it is fitting, at this point, to limit our purview to persons of moral and emotional excellence and ask whether they will be prideful or not. It should be noted that my aim here is not that of defending a life of moral and emotional excellence against other 'options' – although I believe that such a defence is possible on utilitarian grounds (s. 2.3) – but rather to establish the viability of a specific component of such excellence.

The most convenient way of arguing for the value of pridefulness seems to be to emphasise its role as a guardian of self-respect. Couched in utilitarian terms, for instance, the argument would then be that the life of moral and emotional excellence is the life that, *ceteris paribus*, produces most happiness; that self-respect is a necessary ingredient in such a life; and that pridefulness protects, maintains, and reinforces our self-respect. We have already considered this line of argument for shame – an emotion to which the prideful person is strongly prone upon falling short of the moral ideal – namely, that shame is as important a warning signal in the moral realm as fever is in the realm of physical health. Or as Ben-Ze'ev puts it bluntly: 'Shame prevents many people from behaving immorally and from losing their own self-respect.'[8] It may well be true that there is a reason to distinguish between two kinds of shame here, a forward-looking 'deterrent' shame and a backward-looking 'post-mortem' shame, where the first motivates us beforehand to steer clear of actions or emotions which will make us ashamed, but the second hits us, so to speak, after the event. However, it is a mistake to refuse to call the first kind 'shame' and claim that its protective value lies in its constituting *fear* of shame rather than real shame.[9] In forward-looking shame I do more than experience an emotion of fear of what may/will happen if I follow a certain course of action or reaction; rather, I am filled with shame at the recognition that if I really found myself in the circumstances which I am imagining, I might, possibly, succumb to the temptation in question, for instance, that of betraying a member of my own family for financial gain. It is this forward-looking shame, this prior identification with the shame of the proposed action or reaction, which (among other things) deters me from ever doing such a vile thing; it is not only the fear that if I decide to betray my relative, I will feel bad about it afterwards. Similarly, simple pride – the other emotion so frequently generated by pridefulness – need not simply be a backward gaze or savouring of

past glories; it also incorporates a forward-looking identification with courses of actions and reactions that one is likely to choose, and which can make one proud.[10]

Although Aristotle seems to be all at sea about the utilitarian deterrent value of shame, and does not say much directly about the stimulus of forward-looking pride, utilitarian or quasi-utilitarian defences of pride from Enlightenment and post-Enlightenment times tend to have a more distinctively Aristotelian flavour than Aristotle himself: Bain thought of it as a 'feeling prompt[ing] powerfully to self-cultivation and active usefulness', and earlier Hume described pride as reliably useful and reliably pleasing: 'This constant habit of surveying ourselves, as it were, in reflection […] begets, in noble creatures, a certain reverence for themselves as well as others; which is the surest guardian of every virtue.'[11]

Plainly, whatever Aristotle said about shame, in much of ancient morality the avoidance of shame constituted a strong motive for action, reaction, or inaction. Indeed, it is exactly here that many people think we have reached a perilous region where older accounts start to compare poorly with modern ones which have happily replaced 'heteronomous shame' with 'autonomous guilt' as a motivation. I have already claimed that conceptual clarity is best served by regarding guilt as a subclass of shame (s. 3.3). While there is a distinction to be drawn between the two concepts – otherwise one would not form a specific, identifiable subclass of the other – the modern tendency to contrast them as stark opposites lacks a conceptual argumentative point, if it is argued for at all. When reasons are offered for the complete separation of shame and guilt, they are often of the metaphorical and/or rhetorical kind. For example, Taylor maintains that while shame signifies 'the recognition of the failure of the worthy self', guilt implies that for the agent involved 'another self' has emerged which he fails to recognise as his own.[12] But why should every self-attribution of guilt presuppose the idea of a bifurcated self? After beating his wife, a man will typically feel guilty about something that he *himself* did, not that his supposed *alter ego* did, although he might be tempted to say 'I don't understand how I could have done that' – an exclamation that would be equally fitting in many cases of what Taylor would call 'mere shame'. In general, we should avoid reading too much philosophical content into the rhetoric of everyday life.

Apart from *conceptual* considerations, the distinction between the primitive 'outer' evaluation of ancients and the more mature 'inner' evaluation of moderns seems, as Bernard Williams for one has noticed, to be *factually* wrong.[13] First, shame for the ancients did not have to involve the presence of an actual audience; the imagined gaze of an imagined other would do. In other words, one could experience equally strong shame over unworthy conduct which would have resulted in dishonour had one been seen, as over one which in fact was seen. Moreover, in ancient morality, being honoured undeservedly could be as shameful as being dishonoured deservedly. Being a

derivative of *aidoia* (a standard word for the genitals), the Greek word for shame, *aidos*, signifies an experience akin to that of being caught in public with one's trousers down. Shame is the result of being seen, inappropriately, by the wrong people, in the wrong condition. But then people can, as I said, also be ashamed of being admired by the wrong audience in the wrong way. For example, the emperor in H. C. Anderson's famous story could have felt equal shame even if only he, and no one else in the audience, had grasped the meaning of the child's revelation about his 'new clothes'. Nothing in the nature of so-called 'shame societies' thus excludes the possibility of personal moral convictions which contradict those of the (misled) majority. It is an over-simplification to say that the image a person in such a society has of himself 'is indistinguishable from that presented to him by other people'.[14] What matters is whether he can identify with the visions of the given audience or not, and that depends on the content of his own self-respect and how well he deems himself to have lived up to it.

Second, it is also naive to conclude that because the Greeks did not have two separate words for what we call 'shame' and 'guilt', their word *aidos* could not cover the meanings of both. Indeed, as Williams amply demonstrates, *aidos* included elements of inner sanctions, indignation, reparation, and forgiveness: the things typically associated nowadays with guilt rather than shame.[15] A Greek hero was clearly capable of responding emotionally to merely internal sanctions – witness Ajax's suicide.

Recall that we are considering the argument that the value of pridefulness lies in its generating emotions of shame and simple pride that tend to the protection of self-respect. The conceptual and historical connections between shame and guilt notwithstanding, it might still be objected that the same given objective of self-protection can be achieved 'in less destructive ways' than by experiencing shame, and even guilt, emotions which threaten to deplete our most important resources for self-improvement.[16] For example, Kekes argues that instead of flagellating ourselves with the stick of shame, we should concentrate on the attractions of the carrot which our conception of a good life represents. Why, if we stray from our purpose, should we not learn to focus more on the appeal of the purpose from which we strayed rather than to wallow in self-condemnation? Answers to Kekes's question will necessarily be psychological and have to do with the nature of human motivation. The first thing to notice is that people do, fortunately, learn from their mistakes. If we sweep all our mistakes and faltered attempts under the carpet, to concentrate instead on the ultimate prize of all-round excellence, we fail to utilise important possibilities for moral progress. Second, 'ultimate prizes' tend to be less tangible in most people's minds, and yield less easily to instant motivation, than the dangers awaiting us along the way. For instance, more people are surely deterred from smoking by the imminent danger of the lung cancer they might develop in mid-life than by their abstract contemplation of a life of mental and physical well-being: a

life to which a decision to refrain from smoking might (perhaps) contribute. We must not forget that we are seeking a *naturalistic* justification of shame and, more generally speaking, pridefulness, situated in the realm of the actual rather than the ideal.

But then a much more profound and serious objection awaits us: even if it is true that both shame and simple pride need to be felt towards the right people, at the right times, and in the right proportions to preserve self-respect, we cannot further assume, without argument, that this amounts to a justification of *pridefulness*. Pridefulness is an emotion of its own. It does, among other things, dispose a virtuous person to feel simple pride and shame at the proper time but, more than that, to feel those emotions frequently and intensely, and furthermore to be deeply concerned with receiving external recognition of worthy attainments. So, the objector might retort, the problem is not so much that the *megalopsychos* could not feel guilt, as well as shame, but rather that he is moved to action not only by the desire to *be*, but also the desire to be *seen*, as virtuous – a fact which does not tally with more advanced modern ideas about moral self-sufficiency and autonomy.[17] To put it differently, for the prideful person 'the desire to be acknowledged, even celebrated, as virtuous by others is internal to the desire to be virtuous', 'internal to his sense of who and what he morally is'. Thus, his essential relatedness to, and placement before, his peers, goes 'all the way down' to the very bottom of his selfhood.[18]

There is no denying the fact that the self of the prideful person is more other-entwined and other-identified than most modern moral theorists are willing to accept. But is that necessarily a failure? Needless to say, many recent criticisms of modern morality have focused on the very idea of a disembodied, socially rootless person who passes 'autistic' moral judgements in a vacuum, the basis of whose self is supposed to transcend all contingent ends. As a result, we are now happily being offered Aristotelian or Humean conceptions of our sense of self as being derived from social recognition and admiration: as essentially 'heteronomous' in the strict Kantian sense, but at the same time less characterless, less alienated from its counterpart social identity.[19] By drawing on these insights, I want to claim that pridefulness is not only important because it is conducive to the maintenance of self-respect – nor even because most people think it vital to their sense of worth that others recognise their merits – but, more radically, that pridefulness is *psychologically necessary* for the *formation* of that very self which can be respected, namely, of our underlying sense of *personhood* (s. 3.1). It is in order to create and sustain one's personhood that a person must seek recognition from others.

The critical ammunition for this view has perhaps nowhere been as convincingly presented as in the works of Hume. His view that pride produces the idea of self as a continuing agent, while at the same time arguing that pride is caused by a pleasant sensation related to the self, has

puzzled many commentators. Amélie Rorty suggests that he is talking about 'pride' in different senses.[20] This conundrum is, I think, caused by the unfortunate role 'pride' typically plays in ordinary language in expressing both the emotion of simple pride and of pridefulness.[21] If we understand Hume to be talking about pridefulness when he describes the 'pride' which produces our underlying idea of self, his argument becomes more salient, and Rorty's excellent analysis of his view even more to the point.

To have a sense of personhood, we need to have grasped the idea of things being valued and chosen by us. But to grasp that idea, we must first have grasped the idea of things being valued and chosen by others: primarily of ourselves as being valued and chosen, or disvalued and rejected, by them. In other words, the idea of our own self as distinct from, but still essentially of the same kind as, those of others must derive from the very possibility of evaluating our self and its existential connections as equal, superior, or inferior to theirs, and such an evaluation is dependent upon external criteria both for its formation and sustenance. To quote Jerome Neu, 'for certain purposes, who we are is fixed by who others think we are'.[22] Or to put it in terms well known from modern *symbolic interactionism* in social psychology, it is through taking the role of the other that the self acquires its reflexive quality and attains self-consciousness.[23] This early learning process then serves as a filter through which other passions and habits can also become constitutive of our agency as we gradually develop our integrity and self-respect.[24] There is no choice between an autonomous and a heteronomous formation of a self to begin with and, although one can later take autonomous decisions about the content of one's self-respect, the underlying sense of personhood needs to be constantly sustained through social comparison in order for there to be any self which can respect itself. Pride[fulness] leads us to 'think of our own qualities of circumstances', Hume says; it 'cause[s] us to form an idea of our merit and character'.[25] Pridefulness is thus nothing more than (heightened) sensitivity to those features which underlie, create, and co-ordinate our moral actions and reactions, a positive conscious attunement to our social surroundings. More specifically, to be sensitive to pride and shame is to be subtly alert to those social features, those existential connections, that define one's personhood,[26] and hence to questions of moral value in so far as they relate to oneself; to seek merited recognition throughout one's life is to be eager to sustain that locus of the moral self, one's personhood, which enables one to pass rational value judgements and to make reasonable choices.

If my sense of myself requires me to seek recognition from others, and my social existence and social emotions are essential rather than contingent parts of my personhood, pridefulness re-emerges as a perfectly valid motivation from its repressed back-alley existence in our consciousness – for whatever proponents of modern morality have tried to teach us, the passion for glory has always remained the torch of the mind, as is seen most clearly

in films and fiction. This also explains how sensitivity to one's own pridefulness being impugned, and to that of other people doing things which are beneath their dignity – where one, so to speak, becomes ashamed on their behalf – go hand in hand in morally mature persons, binding them together in a community of feeling. Writ large, invoking the term 'shame society' does not any longer, if it ever did, tell against the well-foundedness of the sort of ideal of moral and emotional excellence found, for instance, in Aristotle. 'If it ever did' is a particularly apt reservation, for there is every reason to question whether the appreciation of the value of pridefulness disappeared entirely in modern morality. Perhaps MacIntyre is right in thinking that every human being is (and has always been) potentially a fully-fledged Aristotelian – unless corrupted by that particular kind of idea of a 'divided self' so prized in many modern moral theories.[27] Thus, I am inclined to believe that the man in the street may well be more open than the average philosopher to the view suggested here of pridefulness as a psychological need and a moral requirement.

4.2 The dependence upon luck

In the foregoing discussion, I have presented Aristotle's *megalopsychos* as a pivotal example of a person exhibiting pridefulness. However, an objector might point out that this choice of example reveals a serious underlying defect in my account of pridefulness as a potentially virtuous emotion. The reason given would be that the pridefulness of this character type is often directed at conditions and attainments beyond his own control; he claims recognition for accomplishments which have basically dropped into his lap through strokes of luck and, conversely, experiences shame over conditions for which he cannot himself be held responsible. But does this not contradict the historically and logically powerful assumption that moral evaluations rationally require the moral responsibility of the person evaluated by others or evaluating himself – an assumption that I myself defended against various suggestions to the contrary in section 1.4? In that case, I would have been extolling the virtues of an emotion whose very logic is, in my own account, at best, amoral. Let us take some time to consider this formidable objection.

There is a passage in the *Nicomachean Ethics* where Aristotle says that the results of good fortune 'contribute to' *megalopsychia*: 'For the well-born and powerful or rich are thought worthy of honour, since they are in a superior position, and everything superior in some good is more honoured.' Aristotle is quick to remind us that, in reality, 'it is only the good person who is honourable', but still 'anyone who has both virtue and these goods is more readily thought worthy of honour'.[28] This insistence upon the necessity of external goods and moral luck contrasts sharply – or so we are often told – with the Christian and Kantian assumptions inherent in modern morality

about moral goodness being wholly independent of any worldly contingencies, corruptible by moth and rust. There, a person's *good will* is the only thing which matters – witness the unsurpassable virtue of the widow with her two mites in the New Testament.[29]

It is worth pausing at this juncture to notice that there are divided opinions as to whether 'contributing to' *megalopsychia* means, for Aristotle, that wealth, power and such things merely enhance *megalopsychia* or are necessary for it. Curzer favours the former interpretation.[30] However, I think there are two reasons to doubt that reading. First, the *megalopsychos* possesses *all* the virtues, and that must include the virtue of magnificence: generosity on a large scale. Although the magnificent person is by definition generous, 'generosity does not imply magnificence', for the latter requires 'heavy expenses'.[31] Since one cannot make bricks without straw, a poor person cannot be magnificent, despite good intentions. For Aristotle, 'heavy' in 'heavy expenses' cannot mean 'excessive', for he elsewhere says that 'we can do fine actions even if we do not rule earth and sea', and that 'even from moderate resources we can do the actions expressing virtue'.[32] Nevertheless, we cannot do those actions if 'we lack the resources' entirely:[33] the latter are more than the icing on an already-baked cake. Thus, for Aristotle, *megalopsychia* requires at least a minimal standard of wealth and power, a standard in fact that the majority of people in Greek society could not reach.

The second reason for disputing the claim that for Aristotle riches and other external conditions are not necessary for *megalopsychia* lies in his well-known discussion of how *eudaimonia* itself is partly dependent upon external goods: goods which are either instrumental to or constitutive of virtuous activity:

> For, first of all, in many actions we use friends, wealth and political power just as we use instruments. Further, deprivation of certain [externals] – for example, good birth, good children, beauty – mars our blessedness; for we do not altogether have the character of happiness [*eudaimonia*] if we look utterly repulsive or ill-born, solitary or childless, and have it even less, presumably, if our children or friends are totally bad, or were good but have died.[34]

We must not conclude from this, however, that *eudaimonia* is 'insecurely based' and that even the most virtuous person is some 'kind of chameleon', changing colours constantly along with the winds of fortune. For although 'great misfortunes' may 'oppress and spoil his blessedness', he will at least accept them with equanimity and good temper, and can never become wholly miserable.[35]

If we are forced to judge here the merits of the two conflicting sets of background assumptions, those of Aristotle on the one hand, and those of

the allegedly more 'modern-sounding' ones on the other, it may be helpful to start with the notion of 'reasonable expectations'. Do we really reasonably expect a child who has had to cope with hostile and denigrating conditions in its upbringing – a child whose virtues have not been cultivated by habituation – to turn out as a paragon of moral virtue? Do we reasonably expect people at their beam-ends and/or in wholly dependent positions to be as active in contributing to the well-being of their neighbours as those who are better off and have the resources to lend a helping hand? The mere asking of such questions is, I think, enough to bring out the true nature of our expectations, whatever the Christian and Kantian strands in 'modern morality' command us to believe. Indeed, modern philosophers have written at considerable length about the importance of moral luck,[36] although their message does not seem to have filtered through modern society or effected any radical change in the prevailing assumptions of current moral theories.

Whether we like it or not, luck – both circumstantial and resultant[37] – contributes to the overarching virtue of *megalopsychia*, as to all the other (particular) virtues. Our genes matter, our upbringing matters, our family matters, and so do our living conditions and the people we happen to meet in life. There is, unfortunately, little truth in the promise of *virtute securus*. Virtue is no protecting shield which wards off grief and misfortune; the most great-minded and noble-hearted persons do not always die of old age after a long and happy life, surrounded by their children. Immunity to luck is not as realistic an idea as it may be a soothing one. There is no reason to reject a moral perspective out of hand simply because it accepts that fact of life. Incidentally, luck qua social standing may have mattered more for Aristotle than it would for people in modern Western societies simply because being poor or belonging to the 'baseborn multitude' was more of an insurmountable barrier then than it is now: nowadays, the majority of people can, for instance, afford to be 'magnificent', not merely 'generous', when such gestures are called for. Nevertheless, at any given time, the opportunities a person has for virtuous activity and the expectations people have of that person as a potential benefactor are heavily influenced by the position the individual occupies in society.

It is true that Aristotle's moral system has been described as a paradigmatic *role morality*, and not entirely without good reason. But instead of automatically attaching opprobrium to that notion, we must realise that all moralities are to a certain extent, by necessity, role moralities. As we have noticed, what is morally required or expected of people – supererogatory actions apart – always depends to a large extent on what role they happen to occupy in the given circumstances (that of a mother or a daughter, an employer or an employee, etc.), roles which are either adopted by people or into which they are born. No morality can function without the notion of such role-based reasonable expectations: I can reasonably be expected to tie my child's loose shoe laces, but surely not the shoe laces of all the children in

my neighbourhood (see s. 1.4). To be sure, if one takes the view that morality is socially anchored, then there is something self-contradictory about supposing that modern morality is not. Maybe moderns have never really stopped believing that certain virtues are tightly tied to social roles. However, there is no denying the fact that certain prominent modern moral theories have tried to sever the link to social roles, and it is precisely in those cases that they have fared the worst – witness, for instance, the so-called *strong doctrine of responsibility* espoused by vulgar utilitarianism, according to which we are responsible for any outcome that we could possible have altered, irrespective of costs or (factual, moral) expectations: a doctrine which is, I believe, counter-productive from the utilitarian point of view itself.[38]

There is a common prejudice in modern thinking that role moralities are rigid and unchangeable. However, even a somewhat rigid role moral system, such as that of the Icelandic sagas, does not preclude the possibility of social change and mobility.[39] In a poor and/or a quiescent society, we may have to concede that a great number of people are excluded from the possible roles of *megalopsychos*. But such a concession does not imply that *megalopsychia* is, in principle, a 'privileged' virtue.[40] Indeed, the concession should not be seen as an argument against the historical moral system of Aristotle, but rather as an encouragement to create such economic and social conditions as will give everyone the opportunity of achieving moral excellence.

Much of what I have said so far may perhaps be summed up by the sardonic remark from Brecht's *Threepenny Opera*: 'Grub first, then ethics'. Perhaps, also, the reader may feel that my insistence upon the necessity of moral luck for the good life is now leading me closer and closer to the temptation which I earlier promised to resist, namely, to champion Aristotle's moral account, warts and all. All that I can say here is that such has not been my intention; nor is a general defence of 'ancient morality' necessary for the points that I want to establish in the present section. To recall, the complaint was that the alleged value of pridefulness undermined the assumption that moral evaluations presupposed the responsibility of the agent(s) in question, since much of what the typical prideful person is potentially proud or ashamed, that for which recognition is claimed, is beyond the bounds of that person's emotional agency and hence responsibility. I have so far responded by trying to suggest a plausible sense in which the virtuous life is partly dependent on external circumstances, but a more direct answer to the complaint itself it still needed.

In section 1.4 I explained how evaluations of outcomes can be morally significant in various ways without constituting evaluations of the person(s) involved as moral agents. This recourse may not seem to offer much help here, for the outcomes in which prideful persons take pride and for which they expect/demand recognition are specifically outcomes that affect their assessment – and do/should affect the assessments of others – of themselves

as moral agents. A man, for example, thinks all the better of himself for having given most of the lottery prize he won to charity, and expects to be duly respected for his generosity. In other words, he construes the gift as a credit to himself qua generous person, not only as an abstract moral credit underscoring the value of generosity, the educational importance of teaching people to remember those in need, etc. But then the question remains both whether the alleged value of pridefulness does not discriminate against those less fortunate, since they will have less reason to be prideful simply in virtue of their being less fortunate, and also, more generally, whether it undermine the evaluation-requires-responsibility assumption, since the man who won the lottery prize was after all not morally responsible for the 'manna' which came into his possession 'from heaven' and gave him a chance to be generous. How can an emotion so heavily dependent upon external circumstance, even serendipity, count as a potential moral virtue?

To complicate matters even more, Aristotle starts his famous discussion of moral responsibility with the uncompromising claim that virtue 'is about feelings and actions' and that these receive praise or blame only 'when they are voluntary, but pardon, sometimes even pity, when they are involuntary'.[41] The same idea is pressed repeatedly, for example, when he says that 'we never censure someone if nature causes his ugliness' but only if it is due to 'his lack or training or attention'.[42] But how does this insistence upon personal responsibility square with Aristotle's remark cited earlier in the section that the well-born and powerful or rich are thought more worthy of honour than the rest, since they are in a superior position, and everything superior in some good is more honoured? (Notice that Aristotle must here be talking about deserved honour, that is, honour bestowed only upon those who morally deserve it.)

The present book does not constitute an exegesis of Aristotle. However, let me in the following suggest a way in which we can make sense of these apparently disharmonious claims. If it is found to conflict incurably with something else that Aristotle said or 'really meant', then so much the worse for him but not necessarily for us, since what I am interested in here is a defence of pridefulness rather than a defence of Aristotle.

Consider four men: *P1*, *P2*, *P3*, and *P4*. *P1*–*P3* have all come into large fortunes, perhaps through inheritance, perhaps a lottery prize. *P4*, on the other hand, is poor. *P1* has done a lot of good with his wealth to benefit others, *P2* has not started to utilise his fortune for good deeds, but he has at least preserved it and not let the wealth spoil him morally by leading him into wastefulness or debauchery. *P3* has squandered all his wealth and debased himself. In a certain significant sense, *P1* has not only more to be proud of than *P2* and *P3* (which seems rather obvious) but also more than *P4*. Perhaps *P4* would have become just as worthy of pride and respect if he had had the same opportunities as the other three, and he should clearly not

be *blamed* or blame himself for not doing what was beyond his power. However, he should not be *praised* or praise himself either, for he did not have a chance to prove his mettle. Perhaps *P4* would in fact have fallen into similar temptations as *P3* if he had been in the latter's shoes, even if we deem *P4* in advance, in light of his good character, to have stood a good chance of coping well with a windfall: we know from ample anecdotal evidence and a famous Latin proverb that corruption of the best can become the worst. We also have historical reasons to take seriously the warning that all power corrupts and absolute power corrupts absolutely. Aristotle had, no doubt, something similar in mind when he warned us of how hard it is 'to bear the results of good fortune suitably', and how easily it leads to arrogance, disdain of those less fortunate, and even 'wanton aggression'.[43]

P2 has confessedly not done much good yet with his abundant resources – he has not pulled his weight morally to the same extent as *P1* and has thus less to be proud of. But being uncorrupted by his good fortune makes him a candidate for one kind of praise which is not applicable to *P4*: he has at least proved himself to be an exception to Aristotle's rule of thumb that people in power are more likely to succumb to indecent actions that those of moderate means.[44] In this way we can make sense of Aristotle's claim that those in superior positions are worthy of more honour than the rest, as long as they remain morally uncorrupted, since they are, because of their very position, more open to err.

Some people use their resources badly (such as *P3*), others use them well (such as *P1*), yet others make no use of them at present but at least preserve them for prospective future use (such as *P2*). And then there are those who simply lack the resources (such as *P4*). The interpretation that praise (internal and external) is truly due to *P1* and *P2*, as their pridefulness demands (given that they are prideful persons), in virtue of the way in which they have handled their resources, does not discriminate morally against *P4*. Although not a candidate for praise, *P4* does not shoulder any blame either for not having handled well those resources which were simply not there. If he experiences shame merely because of his poverty, then that emotion is irrational and should be uprooted. From the above considerations we can also divine that the evaluation-requires-responsibility assumption remains intact since *P1–P2* are only praised for outcomes for which they are 'jointly responsible'.[45] They are not supposed to take pride in or accept recognition for their abundance of resources as such but rather for what they did with them. That is also why *P3* has a good reason to be ashamed, whereas *P4* has not.

Other kinds of problematic cases may remain, such as when we, as prideful persons, take pride in or experiences shame over things which do not seem to be our personal doing but rather those of the social group to which we belong (extended family, friends, nation, etc.). However, I think

that these can be rather easily accounted for as cases of shared identity; we often feel that our heritage and social groups are important constituents of what we are,[46] and frequently not without good reason either. After all, we play some part (however small) in influencing the activities of the social groups to which we belong, and we can sometimes be correctly blamed for not having done more to put our neighbours and relatives right. The prideful person, however, is irrational if the shame experienced concerns conditions which are not subject to the person's control, such as the naturally caused irredeemable ugliness that figured in Aristotle's above example.

Or is this wrong? In his explication of the value of pride in identity politics, Jerome Neu challenges the view that even partial, or Aristotle's 'joint', responsibility is a condition of pride. 'If responsibility were a condition of pride, a politics of pride in group identity, where the characteristic defining group identity […] was not itself something deliberately chosen, would make no sense.'[47] Two things may be said in response to Neu's claim. The first is that I think Neu misrepresents the pride at work in identity politics as referring primarily to simple pride ('pride$_1$', to recall a barbarous expression from s. 4.1) or pridefulness ('pride$_3$'), when it is much more easily understood as self-respect ('pride$_2$'). A black man, for instance, acquires pride qua black person through beginning to respect his background and himself and adopt certain principles, views, and values that he previously thought of as degrading. 'Black pride' in that sense does not bring with it any problems of tracing a chain of credit back to a non-responsible self. More generally, while I agree with Neu that 'nearness to self' distinguishes pride (that is, both simple pride and pridefulness) from mere happiness or joy and that taking credit for a valuable object can expand our identity (be 'self-enhancing'),[48] he is, I believe, too generous in his understanding of how claiming group membership is a way of claiming the associated value for oneself. Consider his example of the 'we're number 1!' chant of ecstatic football fans around the world. The fan who has cheered the team on to victory, bought tickets to its matches and so forth, can of course unproblematically feel proud of the team's success, and prideful with respect to the recognition it gets. But what about the only person on a desert island who suddenly decides to become a fan of the San Francisco Forty-Niners football team, without ever having shown an interest in the team before, and subsequently, upon hearing via transistor radio about the team's victories, claims to feel proud? What grounds do we have for saying that this person is experiencing the emotion of pride as distinct from simply that of joy? None, it seems to me – the person is surely better described as joyful than proud – for the kind of group *membership* required for taking pride in the group's successes cannot be claimed simply on a whim. It must require some minimal effort, some minimal participation – that is, some responsibility, however small and partial.

I conclude from all of this that the objection which has been scrutinised in the present section leaves my account of the value of pridefulness untouched. Importantly, I think that this does not only apply to pridefulness as some sort of an ideal emotion, which real people rarely if ever experience, but rather to the earthbound emotion of pridefulness attributable to Aristotle's famous character type, the *megalopsychos*. However, while I frequently have taken my cue from Aristotle in the foregoing argumentation, I repeat that it is meant to rest on more than textual evidence from his writings.

4.3 The extra value of the extraordinary

In section 3.2 I briefly mentioned as an example of the specific suspicions hovering over Aristotle's account of *megalopsychia* the complaint that the *megalopsychos* is inactive and unneighbourly. There I responded somewhat abruptly that such a complaint both illicitly assumes that opportunities for spectacular actions – actions in which the *megalopsychos* allegedly revels – are rare, and fails to take notice of the textual evidence for the constant readiness of the *megalopsychos* to lend a helping hand to neighbours.

However, these charges might reappear at a deeper level in the context of our present exploration of pridefulness as a morally valuable emotion. For it seems explicitly in Aristotle's account that the pridefulness of a supremely virtuous person can only be satisfied through extraordinary deeds. In other words, some spectacular heroics seem to be required for such a person to deserve honour. That, in turn, might, according to a possible objector, be taken to mean that the ideal life of a prideful individual is one of sporadic bursts of great achievements interspersed with extended periods of indolence, periods which are only interrupted when the person starts to suffer unbearably from what nowadays is mockingly referred to as *LDS*: limelight deprivation syndrome. The implications would then be pretty similar to the ones that I tried to rebut in the previous section: that pridefulness is, at best, a *privileged* virtue – this time not, as in 4.2, of those born with silver spoons in their mouths, but rather as a virtue of superhuman heroes. How does the demand for Herculean heroism square with the prevailing assumption of most moral theories (and not only modern ones) that moral perfection does not necessarily require extraordinary situations for its realisation, but rather that we should perform deeds in ordinary situations of life extraordinarily well?

The demand for heroism in a fully virtuous life is often thought to follow from Aristotle's exploration of the whole gamut of conditions of moral character: from bestiality (at worst), through vice and incontinence to continence, virtue and 'heroic' or 'divine' virtue (at best). Even though he says that both the extreme conditions of bestiality and divinity are 'rare among human beings',[49] that remark may be seen to imply that there will be few

people exhibiting *megalopsychia* around at any given time, rather than that *megalopsychia* does not require heroic virtue. Now, since my aim in the present book is not to justify pridefulness as an emotion realisable only (or only to full extent) by Herculean heroes, but rather by people like you and me, I either have to reject Aristotle's account of heroism or his suggestion that such heroism can only be displayed in rare, 'spectacular' circumstances by a limited number of unique individuals. I have no intention of challenging the thesis that the greatest achievements merit, and indeed foster, the greatest respect, so let me opt for the second course: I think that there are opportunities in everybody's life for great achievements – 'heroics' if you like – opportunities which may be chosen and seized upon with relish, but which at least equally are often thrust upon us by external circumstances whether we ask for them or not.

The virtue of *courage* is a good place to start. People tend to take pride in their own courage and feel ashamed when they find themselves showing a yellow streak. The prideful person will be highly concerned with exhibiting courage in the appropriate situations; not only will such situations not be avoided, but they may even be positively sought out. Subsequently, the prideful person will claim recognition for not having run away when that may have seemed, to a less virtuous person, the most alluring recourse. Recall that, as before, I am considering pridefulness as a characteristic emotion in an otherwise virtuous person. The question is whether pridefulness complements and completes virtuousness, or whether it detracts from it. The obvious fact that a vicious person can also be prideful, and that such a person will utilise courage for evil purposes, need not concern us here.

It is salutary at this point to bring in Aristotle's explication of courage, perhaps more fittingly translated into English as 'bravery' since Aristotle's prime example of courage is that of the brave soldier. Why is it that the kind of bravery Aristotle considers to engender the highest esteem is, (in)famously, that of the intrepid soldier 'facing a fine death' in battle? Why is only he 'brave to the fullest extent'?[50] It is easy to understand Aristotle's argument to the effect that fearlessness is to be admired more in proportion to the seriousness of the frightening condition, with prospective death being the most frightening of them all. However, it is more difficult to understand his insistence that fearlessness towards death 'on the sea or in sickness' must be relegated to secondary importance vis-à-vis the primary example of death on the battlefield. Among the considerations Aristotle invokes for the prospect of death in the latter instance being a greater danger, and overcoming it a source of more profound pride than ever realisable by seafarers and the sick, is that fearlessness based on the positive utilisation of strength in order to achieve a potentially realisable goal (victory in battle) is 'finer' than the equanimity or negative surrender to the winds of fortune typically displayed by fearless seafarers and patients.[51]

To avert this conclusion we do not, I think, need to go back on the assumption that actual achievements – not only the purity of intentions – matter for moral assessment (see previous section). What we should question instead is Aristotle's curious underestimation of the 'glory' of the actual measures taken, in typical cases, by courageous seafarers and patients. They do not simply sit back and wait fearlessly for the powers of the ocean or the disease to do their work. The brave seaman tries to the very end to rescue his ship, or at least as many of his shipmates as possible, often jeopardising or sacrificing his own life in the bargain. The brave patient positively fights the disease as long as any hope of recovery remains, and even after that has become a lost cause, tries to safeguard the interests of family and friends, both financially (by arranging affairs in the best possible order) and psychologically (by comforting them and trying to lessen their grief over their imminent loss). A brave soldier may surely contribute gloriously to the defence of a city, but the brave seafarer and patient may also save a considerable number of people from loss: death, financial setbacks, and mental suffering. It is, indeed, difficult for us moderns to envisage more pivotal examples of heroic virtue than that shown by people fighting disasters and disease at all costs. It does not help here to come to Aristotle's rescue by suggesting that there is a time-relative factor built into our assessments of particular kinds of courage, and that because of the admiration for the belligerent acts of the brave soldier in ancient Greece, they would have carried more weight morally there than they do nowadays. For it seems to be less, rather than more, heroic to perform great deeds if they are immediately highly prized: an act of heroism loses value in proportion to the costs incurred by the agent in refraining from performing it – witness the saying that many would be cowards if they dared to.

We may conclude, then, that it is relatively easy to sever the link that Aristotle wanted to uphold between the value of pridefulness in the *megalopsychoi* and his belief that those examples of a standard virtue, such as bravery, which merit the highest regard are confined to extraordinary circumstances, for instance, on the battlefield. Rejection of his *empirical* claims here do not amount to a rejection of the underlying account of pridefulness, any more than the rejection of his claim that students between the ages of 18 and 21 are best advised to concentrate on little else than physical training amounts to a rejection of his general theory of education. Aristotle made many factual errors, but we have, after all, had 2,300 years for the gradual, subtle correction of those.

Incidentally, Aristotle does not even seem to have been fully consistent in his belief that supreme virtue (namely, *megalopsychia*) requires bravery in its war-related sense. For why else does he take Socrates as an example of a *megalopsychos*? Surely it is for his 'equanimity amid the vicissitudes of life',[52] rather than for his heroics on the battlefield, although Socrates seems

admittedly to have been in his element there also.[53] One of the things which characterises the *megalopsychos* is, indeed, for Aristotle, the ability to bear 'many severe misfortunes with good temper'.[54] Perhaps, if Aristotle had written his analysis of bravery today, he would have singled out for special consideration and admiration in the young the courage to withstand peer pressure; few accomplishments seem to be more urgently needed for young people to learn to take pride in than that of daring to 'be different'. For their elders, situations calling for great courage seldom need to be specially sought out; nature has usually provided ample unsolicited tests of fortitude along the course of a lifetime.

To abandon the claim that extraordinary circumstances are required for the satisfaction of pridefulness is not the same as rejecting out and out the extra value of the extraordinary. There is no denying the fact that heroic achievements are particularly valuable and respected, no less today than in the distant past. We need only to recall the typical media reaction when a fire worker rescues an endangered child – or even a cat – from a burning house at considerable risk to himself: our hearts beat faster and our minds are inspired. The point of this section has simply been that in real life we all face situations where we have the opportunity to prove our mettle. That is, the contingencies, and frequent exigencies, of our everyday existence will make ample room for extraordinary acts that merit and win the most golden approbation. Incidentally, one of the problems with the meek, as opposed to the prideful, is their tendency to shy away from even attempting great deeds. While engaged in such deeds, the 'hero' will, need-less to say, have to be *selective*: we hardly blame Nelson Mandela for not having spent much time alleviating the difficulties of dyslexic or autistic children while heroically spending all his time and energy on fighting *apartheid*. However, being (by necessity) selective is a far cry from being indolent and inactive.

The fact that few people in modern times find Aristotle's over-concen-tration on the bravery of soldiers morally warranted,[55] does not undermine the general truth that if people have refused to face danger in times of need, when they should have risen to the occasion, their proper moral reac-tion should be one of shame. The link between heroic acts and pridefulness thus cannot, and should not, be completely severed. As John Casey correctly notes, the best 'primitive' model of courage is of a small child that hurts itself but refuses to cry: it refuses to cry because it does not want to seem a baby, because it is ashamed to cry, because it is prideful. Courage, or for that matter any virtue which requires at times heroic mani-festations, essentially involves, Casey says, 'one's having a picture of oneself in relation to others, having a sense of one's place in the world, taking seri-ously one's reputation'.[56] As I have presented pridefulness in the preceding sections, this is both educationally, psychologically, and morally true.

4.4 Moral equality, modesty, and humility

A quick search utilising a popular search engine on the World Wide Web disclosed, in March 2000, 200 instances of the word 'pridefulness' in 166 distinct sources. Interestingly enough, most of the sources were religious sites where pridefulness turned out, on a closer look, to be invoked and condemned as a symbol of conceit and haughtiness. The common opprobrium attached to this notion nowadays (that is, to pridefulness and to pride when that term is used to denote pridefulness) is no doubt heavily influenced by Christian ideas about hubris being the *radix omnium malorum* – the root of all evil – and Kantian ones about the basic equality of moral worth among persons, each one being an irreplaceable subject in a kingdom of ends.

Recall, however, that the historical character type exhibiting pridefulness, which has so far served as my main source of inspiration, the *megalopsychos*, is *modest* by definition. That is, he does not over-estimate his merits; he thinks himself worthy of much only because he *is* worthy of much. This character type is starkly contrasted with those who over-estimate their merits: the arrogant and the vain. Aristotle also contrasts the *megalopsychoi* with the pusillanimous: the unduly meek and humble who underestimate their merits.

Now, if the prideful person is, conceptually, to be placed in the middle between those individuals who exhibit hubris and haughtiness, on the one hand, and those (existent or non-existent ones) who undervalue their standing, on the other, we may ask why pridefulness is so frequently equated with one of its excesses – witness the results of my Web search. Is there some logical or linguistic confusion at work here? Obviously, one of the reasons may be that the word 'pridefulness' means the same as 'arrogance' for some people; they might then modify their account if they abided by my specification of the underlying concept in section 3.3. Another source of confusion is undoubtedly the frequent conflation of the terms 'modesty' and 'humility', even in academic circles; it is often not entirely clear whether people (lay people and scholars alike) are speaking about non-overestimation of merits (which I call here 'modesty') or underestimation (here 'humility') when they invoke either of the two terms in question.[57] The third reason might be the (not so implausible) psychological belief, apparently held by many, that the balance of prideful modesty is difficult to maintain, and that a person trying to strike such a balance is liable to err on the side of arrogance rather than humility. Even so, a realistic, high self-estimate is fully compatible with a low-key demeanour,[58] and a true *megalopsychos* has learnt not to flaunt his excellence, being free from any inclination to marvel, or even to talk about himself.[59]

However, there are much more profound and morally significant reasons for the widespread disapproval of those persons who pridefully think them-

selves superior to others, believing themselves to have, in fact, more merit. Let me in the following consider three such reasons and the respective objections to my account of pridefulness as a moral value which they entail.

The first objection states that true modesty requires – *pace* Aristotelian morality – humility. A religious version of this objection is that all human achievements fade and dwindle when compared to the omnipotence and unlimited goodness of God. Thus, the prideful modesty of the *megalopsychos* signals a vice qua lack of awareness of the gulf dividing man and God. Howard Curzer has tried to rebut this objection by insisting that the transvaluation of *megalopsychia* from Aristotelian virtue to Christian vice is wrong. Pridefulness, according to Christianity, is taking oneself to be more worthy than one really is, but the *megalopsychoi*, who think themselves worthy of greater things than others, are *ex hypothesi* really worthy of them. Thus, Christian doctrine could not define *megalopsychoi* as prideful but rather as non-existent, there being no persons around satisfying Aristotle's criteria (with Jesus, perhaps, constituting an exception).[60] However, Curzer's defusing of this transvaluation does not really work, for Aristotle is not depicting an idealised character type which may or may not exist. He is demarcating the characteristics of certain existing persons who take themselves to be (and *are* according to Aristotle) morally superior to others. Hence, what the *megalopsychoi* understand as correct self-knowledge must, for Christians, constitute a vice qua blameworthy false beliefs. Incidentally, Curzer is not alone in wanting to assimilate Aristotle to more 'modern' accounts in some ways; much of what passes nowadays for Aristotelian ethics is highly contrived in order to achieve such an assimilation – witness the already-mentioned elision of *megalopsychia* from much of the current work on Aristotle.

Since the present book has little to say about theological questions, let us focus instead on a common secular version of the modesty-requires-humility objection. The traditional message there is: although you may run faster than others, climb higher mountains or solve more complicated mathematical puzzles, you are definitely inferior to them in some other respects, for no one excels in everything. To be on the safe side, it is thus better to underrate one's achievements than to overrate them, that is, to be *humble*.[61] This will, then, be the main reason why even non-religious moderns tend to view the insistence of the *megalopsychos* upon his own superior standing, as well as his proclivity to pull rank, negatively; he must surely, like everyone else, have his weak spots.

A second, but related kind, of objection has been advanced by Ben-Ze'ev. He claims that truly modest people evaluate their fundamental human worth as similar to that of other people, thus exhibiting a kind of egalitarianism:

> This evaluation rests on a belief in the common nature and fate of
> human beings and on a belief that this commonality dwarfs other

differences. Modest people believe that (a) with regard to the fundamental aspect of human life, their worth as a human being is similar to that of other human beings, and (b) all human beings have a positive worth which should be respected.[62]

Ben-Ze'ev does not think that modesty requires the underestimation of one's worth – in this way the second objection distinguishes itself from the first – but he claims that true modesty requires us to view our (realistic) judgements of a superior position as being inevitably relative to a particular evaluative framework. And the value of one such framework (excellence in physics, for example) must not be exaggerated in comparison with other evaluative frameworks, especially given the fundamental equality of general human worth. Prideful modesty, such as that experienced and displayed by the *megalopsychos*, is 'problematic' precisely because 'there will always be people superior to us in some respects'.[63]

Stephen Hare has launched a memorable counter-attack on these two kinds of objections. He first asks us to notice that the examples which are supposed to show that no one is best at everything are often of runners, mountain-climbers, or mathematicians. But what if someone has reached a higher echelon of morality, is more virtuous than others?[64] This question presents the objector with a dilemma: *either* the answer is that nobody is, in the end, more virtuous than others. But that seems to be highly counter-intuitive; was Mother Theresa not a morally better person than, say, Saddam Hussein? *Or* the answer must be that although *A* may be morally better than *B*, *A* does not run as fast or climb such high mountains, or whatever. But the problem with that answer is that moral worth really does seem to provide us with an unoverridable criterion of human worth. If a man is a villain, it adds in no way to his human worth that he happens to run fast (quite the contrary: he may then be able to escape more easily from the scenes of his crimes). These considerations seem to rebut the points of both the first and second objections in so far as these are directed against what I have here referred to as the 'prideful modesty' of the *megalopsychoi*, for their realistic self-assessment is of themselves as paragons of moral virtue, not as physicists, mountaineers, or anything else. The second objection could be supplemented by the claim that it is morally and/or psychologically impossible to be virtuous at all times, that moral people can still learn from others, that they should respect others, and refuse to see others as 'less human', in any sense, than themselves. However, all of these claims can be accommodated – and even the stronger one, which I suggest later, that people are, in a certain sense, of equal worth as (potentially) moral persons – without relinquishing the view that assessments of *moral virtue* take place within a single 'evaluative framework', and that within such a framework one can realistically and modestly deem oneself to be – on the whole, at least – more virtuous than another.

A third kind of objection has recently been suggested by A. T. Nuyen. Aware of the perils of the first and second objection, Nuyen does not find fault with the pridefully modest person remaining non-humble, or non-alert to alternative evaluative frameworks. His point is, rather, that truly modest persons know how to put their achievements, including moral ones, in perspective by taking into account the wider circumstances in which those achievements are made. In other words, because it is unlikely that a person can accomplish something extraordinary entirely single-handedly, true modesty gives 'due considerations to all the factors that contribute to one's success, other than one's own effort'. 'Not spreading the credit around is claiming for oneself a disproportionate amount', and thus true modesty precludes pridefulness which constantly claims respect and recognition for the agent specially.[65]

This is a formidable objection to certain possible accounts of prideful-ness: namely, those which would suppose that the objects of pridefulness can properly be ones for which the agent bears no responsibility – being 'born' with a kind heart, having had a fortune fall into one's lap, etc. However, on the account of pridefulness defended in section 4.2, proper pridefulness only concerns those achievements which come within the purview of the agent's responsibility and sustained exercise of moral choice, the value the agent adds to the fruits of moral luck whether by generously spreading them around or, at very least, by keeping them unspoiled. There seems nothing contradictory about the idea of fully appreciating the contribution made by external circumstances and other persons to one's virtuous acts and emotions, and yet remaining pridefully modest, that is, realistically believing and cherishing that one has more moral worth, in virtue of what one has felt and done of one's own accord, than those less virtuous.[66]

Perhaps the modern obsession with people's equal human worth is, à la Nietzsche, characteristic of the degeneracy of modern morality. Or perhaps it is simply, à la Bernard Williams, one more example of people conflating what they think they think with what they really think (see s. 4.1). In any case, Aristotelian assumptions about the different levels of people's moral excellence seem here more realistic and productive: furnishing us, for example, with the necessary conditions for moral educators' ability to teach their protégés by example. Otherwise, the latter would have little to learn from the former. Notably, such assumptions of moral inequality do not undermine many other ideals of equality which we moderns tend to cherish – for to grant that people are of unequal *moral worth as persons*, depending on their demonstrated level of moral attainment, is not necessarily tanta-mount to considering them of unequal *worth as moral persons*.[67] For instance, there are undoubtedly sound utilitarian reasons for giving all people, as potential moral agents, a chance to prove their mettle (by providing equal opportunities of education, giving strangers the benefit of the doubt in human relations, etc.), and by respecting their 'human rights'

(such as considering people innocent until proven guilty). Logically, there is nothing wrong with the idea of people, who happen to be of unequal moral worth as persons, being treated equally, for moral reasons, in various spheres of life.

Indeed, a certain moral *egalitarianism* of this kind can be culled from Aristotle's insistence that everybody should be judged on merit: that is, people should not be discriminated against for no good reason. The scale used to weigh different persons must be the same, although the outcomes will as a matter of fact be different. In this sense, there might be some reason to modify the claim made somewhat uncritically at the end of section 2.3 that Aristotle's ethics is elitist. If we define *elitism* as the view that different individuals are to count differently in moral or political judgement, then it would be helpful to distinguish between two kinds of elitism: strong and weak. According to *strong* elitism, people will, *by necessity*, count differently in virtue of some necessary characteristics; there is no need for a second look. This was evidently not Aristotle's view; rather, he thought that certain groups of people (women, slaves, manual workers, etc.) do, *as a matter of fact*, have less moral worth because of their limited capabilities. Such *weak* elitism is, however, always open to revision in light of new factual evidence, since the scale to weigh people's moral worth remains one and the same for everyone, and there is no a priori assumption of difference.

To take stock at the end of this chapter, none of the objections raised in the present or previous sections seems to have undermined the moral value of pridefulness. Nor has any anachronism of Aristotle's 'old' moral outlook, from which many of my arguments and examples stem, been revealed. If anything, the discussion has highlighted the contemporaneity of this outlook – perhaps reinforcing Williams's insight that in our ethical situation we are now 'more like human beings in antiquity than any Western people have been in the meantime',[68] or perhaps simply underlining the fact that basic elements in human nature (s. 2.1) remain the same, irrespective of time and place.

The modern alternative of rejecting the value of pridefulness seems neither ennobling nor educative, neither pleasurable nor useful. Quite the opposite, modern morality's denial of our right to take pride in our own moral achievements, our right to comport ourselves with the grace associated with a superior moral position – should we have reached it – and our right to demand an acknowledgement of such standing from others, may threaten our self-respect, and more fundamentally, if Hume is right, also threaten our sense of self. In the well-chosen words of Tara Smith, the demand for humility, or at least for self-effacing, rather than prideful, modesty, 'is likely to cripple one's morale. By puncturing one's commitment to any purpose, it will deflate one's energy, enthusiasm, and appetite for action'.[69] In a recent article, G. F. Schueler echoes the opposite and more prevailing view: 'The fact that […] a person cares about whether others are

impressed with her for her accomplishments reveals, as one might say, a certain hollowness of self.'[70] If the arguments of the present chapter hold good, we are able to turn this received wisdom upside down and say that it is indifference to, rather than concern with, merited recognition that reveals hollowness: the hollowness of a person lacking self-respect and even personhood.

5

IN DEFENCE OF JEALOUSY

5.1 Jealousy as a type of envy

Jealousy constitutes a standard 'negative' emotion (see s. 1.4), that is, an emotion to which opprobrium has typically been attached. According to the traditional view, shared by philosophers, psychologists, and the general public alike, jealousy is the sign, if not of an irredeemably corrupt mind, then at least of an excessively possessive and insecure character. At best, jealous persons are considered to be suffering from a pathological condition standing in need of a cure; at worst, they are stigmatised as blackguards. Some have even wanted to claim that jealousy is the most evil of emotions: the one rightly exciting the least pity in us for persons experiencing it.

During the recent renascence of emotion research, jealousy has aroused special interest, and as a result, some modifications of this traditional view have been suggested. One is more likely to read nowadays than before that, as opposed to envy, jealousy is 'not as objectionable as it is generally made out to be';[1] it does not deserve its 'unqualified opprobrium',[2] or that envy is at least 'the more vicious of the two'.[3] In the present chapter, I aim to strike an even more violent blow at the received wisdom by defending the thesis that jealousy can in many cases be justified as a rational and a morally fitting emotional response. My eventual claim, in section 5.4, will be that, so far from necessarily being a weakness or a vice, jealousy – as a mean between two excesses – is to be considered a virtue to which pride of place should be given in a well-rounded life: that experiencing jealousy at the right time, toward the right people, and in the right amount constitutes an essential element of human *eudaimonia*. I have already advanced a case for pridefulness as a value in human life; now I propose to show that jealousy is a necessary condition of pridefulness, and hence that it both acts as an important guardian of self-respect and also contributes, at a deeper level, to the formation and maintenance of personhood. The emotion of jealousy in this sense is a value which should be fostered rather than discouraged in moral education, an issue upon the practicalities of which I expand in a separate section (s. 6.4).

As a prelude to the moral justification of jealousy in section 5.4, the present section argues for a new conceptual framework which affords a serviceable way of looking at jealousy and its relationship to envy. More specifically, I argue that, contrary to the general consensus in previous accounts, jealousy is best seen as a type of envy.[4] Section 5.2 compares and contrasts my analysis with various other views, and section 5.3 then probes the nature of sexual jealousy, the special features of which have often diverted attention from the more fundamental conceptual issues at hand.

As noted above, the eventual goal of this chapter is to offer an antidote to the traditionally negative evaluation of jealousy among moral philosophers, psychologists, and educators. However, a start toward this goal can only be made by relocating the place of jealousy within the larger conceptual terrain and thereby securing an improved understanding of what this emotion really is.[5] The need for a 'critical naturalistic revision' (s. 1.3) of this terrain, as a prelude to further inquiry, is extremely important as people's opinions about the extensions of the basic terms in question seem to be highly divided. For instance, an informal survey that I recently conducted among fifty first-year students in nursing and occupational therapy, where they were asked to write down standard examples of envy and jealousy and then to define briefly the two concepts, revealed a confusing disarray of ideas. Many of the examples given of envy happened to involve cases of what I, below, call 'emulation' rather than 'envy', and for jealousy a whole gamut of characteristics appeared, ranging from jealousy being 'more subjective' and 'more long-lasting' than envy, to being 'less personal' and 'more short-lived'. These results confirmed my hunch that in order to say anything morally constructive about envy and jealousy, more than a little trimming of the ragged edges of ordinary language would be required: trimming which aims at conceptual clarification and economy, coherence, and serviceability, while still trying to retain as many considered judgements of laymen and experts as possible. Most importantly, we must, I realised, explore the conceptual terrain from a wide perspective – encompassing the area of such surrounding emotions as indignation, anger, and *Schadenfreude* – in order to understand how jealousy can most profitably fit into the system. What we find below is that some of those emotions are even more closely related than has previously been noticed.

Let me use as my starting point a thought experiment that brings out, I believe, all the significant variations of the concept of envy and helps us to think about what exactly distinguishes them from each other. This thought experiment is not offered here in lieu of a thorough conceptual analysis. The arguments for dividing up the conceptual terrain in the way I propose will gradually present themselves during the course of my discussion in this and the following section, especially when my proposal clashes with alternative conceptualisations. For expository purposes, however, I think that this is a good way to start.

Suppose that during the Klondike gold rush, *C*, a mine owner, gives two portions of his claim, appearing to be of equal size and promise, to his two sons, *A* and *B*. They both start digging, and as it happens, *B*, after having worked on his shaft for a while, begins to turn out wagonloads of rich ore. Meanwhile, the shafts worked by *A* prove to be barren. *A* not only *covets* *B*'s gold, that is, he is not only 'concerned with having something', which is characteristic of simple covetousness, but also, he is 'concerned with someone who has something',[6] that is, he *envies* *B* his superior position: his riches and status qua successful gold prospector. The envy involves *A*'s wishing that *B* could be deprived of his gold in some way and, additionally, that it would come into *A*'s possession – or at least that *B*'s relative advantage over *A* in this respect be somehow eliminated. Let us then envisage some variations in our scenario:

(a) *B* has toiled away at his shaft day and night while *A* spent most of his time drinking in a nearby saloon. *A* is non-self-deceptively aware of this, but still harbours malicious thoughts towards *B*, resenting him because of the very fact of *B*'s success as compared to his own.

(b) *A* has good reason to believe that during the night, *B* dug up ore from a ledge *A* had found and carried it to his own shaft, pretending that he had excavated it from there. *A* resents *B* because of his superior position which *A* considers to be the result of an ill-gotten gain: the gold which should have been *A*'s by right.

(c) The kind-hearted and hard-working *A* has toiled away at his shaft for months while the rough and lazy *B* spent his time drinking in a saloon. *A* has found no gold whatsoever, but on the first day *B* seriously buckles down to work, he starts to dig up rich ore. *A* resents *B*'s undeserved serendipity.

(c)$_1$ *A* has good reason to believe that *C* knew in advance that the ore in the part he gave to *B* was much richer than in the part with which he presented *A*. Considering himself at least equally as good a son of *C* as *B* is, *A* resents *B* because of his superior position, resulting from *B*'s undeserved privilege, and is angry with *C*.

These variations in our original scenario exemplify, as I said above, what I take to be the main variants of envy, classified according to its *source*, variants that may at times shade into one another in real life but should still for clarity's sake be pried apart conceptually. I shall call them (a) *invidious* envy, (b) *angry* envy, (c) *indignant* envy, and – most importantly for our present purposes – (c)$_1$ *jealous* envy, or *jealousy*.

Notice that I do not include here as a fourth prospective variant of envy the emotion experienced in the following situation:

(d) *A*, realising that *B*'s success is a result of *B*'s own hard work while *A* wasted his time boozing in the saloon, admires *B* for his diligence. He dreams that he could also be as hard-working and successful, but does not wish that *B* be deprived of his rewards.

Such an emotion is sometimes referred to as 'admiring' or 'emulative' envy, but I think it would be wiser to omit the reference to envy altogether, as this fourth variant violates one of the conditions of the original scenario, namely *A*'s wishing that the gold be somehow taken away from *B*. In envy, we not only covet the envied thing but we wish that the relative advantage that *B* has over us, through possessing it, be eliminated, which – when other equalising measures are not at hand – will boil down to the wish of *B*'s being deprived of this very thing in some way, and that it fall instead to our lot. In situations such as (d), we do say in everyday language that we 'envy' persons such as *B* their character traits and/or some things they possess, but it is a radically different sense of 'envy' from that experienced in (a)–(c)$_1$: we simply express, with admiration, the desirability of being like *B* in some respect.[7] By refusing to equate 'envy' in this friendly, colloquial sense with proper envy, I follow a tradition harking back to Aristotle who takes great care in demarcating an emotion that he refers to as emulation (*zelos*), which involves an effort to attain good things for oneself, as practiced for example by the virtuous *megalopsychoi*, and distinguishing it from envy (*phtonos*), which involves wishing that one's neighbour did not possess those things, and trying to prevent the other from having them.[8] However, Aristotle seems to consider only invidious envy, and hence quickly dismisses morally *all* envy as 'bad and characteristic of the bad'.[9] He does not mention other possible variants although there is much in his analysis of (righteous) indignation that tallies with my account of indignant and jealous envy as we see below.

What separates 'jealous envy' (hereafter simply 'jealousy') from (other kinds of) envy in the above genetic classification? As an initial suggestion, it might be pointed out that (c)$_1$ depends upon a three-party context, involving *A*, *B*, and *C*, whereas variants (a), (b), and (c) involve only two persons, *A* and *B* (and covetousness would only involve a single person, *A*, and an object, the gold). It has, indeed, been convincingly argued by various writers that jealousy is *necessarily* a three-party relation:[10] that – to introduce a somewhat cumbersome terminology for use in the sequel – *A* is always jealous *of B with respect to* a third party, *C*. However, only minor alterations in scenarios (a) and (b) are needed to change the relations there from two-party to three-party ones. Suppose in (a)$_1$, *A* maliciously envies *B* because of the fact that their father *C*, having reasonably had more faith in *B*'s industry, gave *B* a better part of his claim; and in (b)$_1$, *A*'s envy is sparked off by his realisation that *C* gave *B* a better part although he had solemnly promised beforehand to give both sons an equal share. After these alterations, (a)$_1$ is

still a case of invidious envy and (b)$_1$ of angry envy. Thus, although jealousy necessarily involves three parties, whereas invidious and angry envy do not, this feature is not *sufficient* to distinguish jealousy from the other two variants of envy, as manifested in the above scenarios. As for indignant envy (c), if we change the story there so as to involve three persons rather than two, what we end up with is a scenario along the lines of (c)$_1$, which indicates that jealousy is basically indignant envy in a three-party context. Cases of type (c) thus differ interestingly from (a) and (b) in that the name we give to *A*'s emotion changes in (c), but remains unchanged in (a) and (b), when a dyadic personal relation changes to a triadic one. In order to focus on the substantive moral distinction between jealousy and the other variants, it is thus best to concentrate in the following on those examples which involve three parties, that is, on (a)$_1$, (b)$_1$, and (c)$_1$.

Another division of envy is possible which might initially be thought helpful in distinguishing the different variants: the division between *object-envy* and *state-envy*. In the former sort of case, *A* enviously desires the good *B* has, whereas in the latter *A* is simply envious of *B*'s having the good without necessarily wanting to possess it in any way. It is true that state-envy is common in cases of jealousy: a wife who has left her husband may later be intensely jealous of a new woman in his life, although there is nothing she wants less than starting over again with him herself. In such a case, *A* is not gnashing her teeth at what *B* has got, namely *C*'s love, but rather at the very fact that *B* has got it (from *C*). The same might apply in (c)$_1$: *A* could completely lose (object)-interest in possessing any gold himself, seeing this yellow metal as the devil's curse, but still remain (state)-envious of *B*'s having received the rich ore as a gift from *C*. (Importantly, even if *A* desired the gold, he would not have it.) However, the same could also happen in (a)$_1$ and (b)$_1$: *A* might continue to envy (invidiously or angrily) *B* of the state in which *B* finds himself as a result of *C*'s special favour although *A* has, for some reason, lost interest in the gold itself. Hence, the distinction between object- and state-envy, interesting as it is in itself, is irrelevant to our present task of separating jealousy from other kinds of envy.

The same goes for yet one more distinction, that between, on the one hand, envying *B* of *precisely the same thing* (object or state) that *B* has got and wanting it for oneself, and, on the other hand, simply wishing to eliminate *B*'s relative advantage through acquiring an equally good or better thing of *the same kind*.[11] Perhaps *A*'s jealousy in (c)$_1$ could be slaked if *C* gave him an another equally promising part of his claim, but the same applies in (a)$_1$ and (b)$_1$; what *A* desires there is not necessarily the same favour that *B* got but the same kind of favour or a better one. D. Farrell thinks, by contrast, that jealousy distinguishes itself, among other ways, from envy in that in jealousy *A* desires some unique thing that he and *B* cannot share at the same time.[12] However, even in romantic jealousy this is not always the case: *A* may desire the amorous attention that his friend *B* is

getting from the pulchritudinous C, but to quench A's jealousy it is not always necessary that this particular C turn her attention to A, but merely that he gets the same kind of attention from some other equally significant C. What sparks off A's jealousy in such cases is the very fact that B gets more attention, not from a particular woman but from desirable women in general than A does. This does not change the fact, well brought out in Farrell's account, that what bothers A in jealousy is not only that B has got some favour that A wants but rather that B has got it from someone who is important to A.[13] This 'someone important', however, need not be a particular unique person (it could be one of a set of such persons); in any case, Farrell's conceptual demand will not help distinguish jealousy from other kinds of envy, as we can easily imagine a case, for instance, of invidious three-party envy along the lines of $(a)_1$ where A's immoral claim is, indeed, for a favour from a particular unique person, C, and only him.

Instead of focusing on the number of parties involved, the difference between objects and states, or two different kinds of identity relating to the desired thing – distinctions which cut across the above classification of three kinds of envy – let me suggest the following specifications. Common to all types of *envy* is A's resentment toward B because A believes B has got or is about to get a thing (an object or a state) which A wants for himself, coupled with the desire for this something to be taken away from B, or at least for B's relative advantage over A as possessor of this thing to be eliminated. If A had the thing earlier himself or believed that he would get it, we have what might be called *grudging* envy; if not, A's envy could be considered *coveting*. Given that the envious relation is a three-party one, as in $(a)_1$, $(b)_1$, and $(c)_1$, a third element enters in: A's anger towards C. However, if we want to distinguish between the different variants of envy, this general schema must be fleshed out by the details of each particular case. That is, the emotion must be traced back to its source or origin. We need to ask: What are the concerns fuelling A's resentment towards B and anger towards C? In responding to this question, I believe we end up with one of the three variants above: $(a)_1$, $(b)_1$, or $(c)_1$.

In invidious envy, A resents B's superior position and B's relative favouring by C as such, and wishes maliciously, that is, without any good moral reason, to deprive B of it; in angry envy and jealousy, by contrast, the resentment is fuelled by righteous indignation, and the anger towards C also has moral grounds, albeit different ones, in the two different emotions. If this is true, there is no such emotion as pure envy: being envious is rather a formal characteristic of three distinct emotions.[14] No one normally desires a thing that another person has, believes that the other person should not have it, and, additionally, believes that the latter should not have got it from a third party in the first place, unless he has some reasons for his beliefs. Or to put it more accurately: if such reasons are not forthcoming or are amoral/immoral, then A invidiously envies B and is unjustifiably angry

with *C*. If *A* has moral reasons for his beliefs, then his resentment can be explained as (potentially justifiable) righteous indignation towards *B* and (potentially justifiable) anger towards *C*, and the emotion as a whole should be called either angry envy or jealousy depending on the nature of the anger involved, as I shall explain presently. In other words: envy is always part of a compound emotion, with one of the most common of these being jealousy.

To enlarge this glimpse of jealousy and its siblings, it is necessary to say something more about the constitutive emotions. Aristotle's *Rhetoric* contains an important discussion of the emotion of righteous indignation (*nememis*; hereafter only 'indignation'). *Indignation* is, according to Aristotle, a commendable emotion characterised by pain at undeserved *good* fortune, and whose proper contrary is another commendable emotion: *pity*, which is pain at undeserved *bad* fortune. It is 'right to sympathize with and pity those who suffer undeservedly and to feel indignation at those who [undeservedly] fare well; for what takes place contrary to deserts is unjust'.[15] Both emotions thus arise from the same moral character and are aroused by the same sense of justice: the desire to right a wrong. These two emotions play an important role in supplementing Aristotle's somewhat incomplete account of justice in the *Nicomachean Ethics*, for they explain how a sense of justice can be at work in cases where one is neither the distributor of goods, nor the one distributed to, but an external third party, not directly involved in the distribution process.[16]

Unfortunately, a lot goes amiss when Aristotle tries to fit indignation and pity into his usual architectonic of virtues as golden means between two extremes. For example, he thinks that the deficiency of indignation is *Schadenfreude*, pleasure at the suffering of others, when it seems more in line with his own schema to see indifference to undeserved good fortune as the deficiency. Most commentators have been tempted to emend Aristotle here, and I have already done so in the list of his moral virtues in section 3.2, where I consider indignation to have as its extremes indifference to personal injustice (deficiency) and begrudging spite (excess), and pity to be flanked by, on the one hand, callousness to the undeserved suffering of others (deficiency) and, on the other, hypersensitivity or sentimentality (excess): being pained too much by too little. I am partly indebted to Howard Curzer for these proposals, but he goes even further by consolidating pity and indignation into a single virtuous emotion, *nemesis*: the disposition to be pleased and pained on the right occasions.[17] Although this departs much further from the letter of Aristotle's account than I propose here, Curzer could argue that it retains its spirit, for the natural corollaries of Aristotle's pity and indignation are the dispositions to be pleased at deserved misfortune and deserved fortune. These four dispositions, all stemming from the same moral character, would then make up what we might call 'sense of justice' qua emotion.

Ben-Ze'ev wants to equate *Schadenfreude* with pleasure at deserved misfortune.[18] Notwithstanding the many instances where people self-deceptively sublimate their *Schadenfreude* as a belief about deserved misfortune, Ben-Ze'ev's problem is that he has, subsequently, no emotion word left to refer to that of crowing over undeserved misfortune: the negative emotion par excellence. John Portmann, who shares Ben-Ze'ev's conception of *Schadenfreude* as riding on 'the coat-tails of justice',[19] proposes that we use the expression 'malicious glee' for the emotion of taking pleasure in undeserved misfortune. In the following, however, I shall use the more common expression *Schadenfreude* to denote such pleasure, assuming that it is the excess of an unnamed emotion (call it a specific form of *nemesis* if you like, à la Curzer) having to do with pleasure at deserved misfortune. *Schadenfreude* is, it seems, commonly attached to invidious envy; what A desires is, then, not only that the envied thing fall into his possession but that B suffers at the loss of it, without any good moral reason. However, *Schadenfreude* is not necessary for invidious envy; it suffices that A has no moral concern for B's loss hoped for by A, namely, that A is completely indifferent to B's unjustified deprivation, rather than that A gloats over it. This is why I said above that invidious envy includes, in addition to the envy part, either amoral or immoral reasons for wanting to deprive B of the envied thing, or, alternatively, the fact that no reasons are forthcoming at all (which makes the envy negligently invidious).

Aristotle's specification of *anger* is even more renowned than that of indignation: 'Let anger be [defined as] desire, accompanied by [mental and physical] distress, for conspicuous retaliation because of a conspicuous slight that was directed, without justification, against oneself or those near to one'.[20] It is reasonable to suppose that the unjustified 'slight' is unfair either because it is violation of a *moral right* in a strict sense (that is, a violation of an obligation, narrowly understood, as one to which the violator has overtly or covertly consented),[21] or because it is a violation of *moral deserts*. The distinction between rights and deserts is a plausible one, for just as desert claims are not necessarily grounded in anyone's obligations, obligations may sometimes conflict with what is morally deserved, all things considered.[22] This explains, I maintain, the supposed difference between angry envy (in a three-party context) and jealousy, even if both have anger and indignation as constituents. In angry envy, A is indignant of B's success, and angry because C has violated A's *moral right*: in our case $(b)_1$, for example, through C's breach of promise. However, in jealousy, A is indignant of B, and angry with C for violating *moral deserts*. C had not promised in $(c)_1$ to give his sons equally promising parts of his claim, and does not violate any obligation (in a strict sense) by discriminating against A, but A still believes that he deserved a better deal from C, given that he has done nothing to deserve such a measly reward from his father. A is shocked and hurt: 'B surely isn't a better son than I am, so why did C

reward B more than me? It simply isn't just!' Plainly, both angry envy and jealousy can and do frequently co-occur, for instance, in the common cases where a violation of a moral right also happens to be a violation of moral deserts, but as in case $(c)_1$, the jealousy felt by A need not be accompanied by what I have called angry envy.

We now see what I meant by saying that envy never appears on its own but always as part of 'blended' or 'compound' emotions, that is, emotions which are compounds of other more 'basic' (in a relative sense; see s. 1.3) emotions. As remarked earlier, 'compound' must here be understood to refer to a unique combination, not merely co-existence. In jealousy, the envy, indignation, and (special kind of) anger do not simply co-occur but appear as a singular blend.[23] If we remove the anger and the indignation from case $(c)_1$, we are not left with 'pure jealousy' but rather with invidious envy. Moreover, indignation can easily occur independent of envy. We can imagine ourselves, in situations such as $(c)_1$, merely experiencing a sense of injustice towards B's undeserved success without feeling envy at all. Or we can be indignantly envious of his success without feeling jealous because, for some reason, we do not care specifically about the fact that he received the relevant favour from C. We can also simply be angry at C for his unwarranted gesture without focusing at all on what B got out of it or how to deprive him of it.[24] However, in jealousy, the anger, indignation, and envy appear in a unique combination; our concern then not only involves abstract indignation or a desire to stand up for fair treatment against C, but also resentment towards B and the desire to deprive him of something that he has got. Can these three constituents co-occur without forming jealousy – that is, can I be independently indignant towards B, angry with C, and envious of B's success without being jealous of B? Psychologically, the answer must be yes, but such a co-existence of separate emotions would be irrational. For if the envy in question is utterly unconnected to indignation and anger, then it must be invidious envy, which in turn means that A is invidiously envious of B (with respect to C) while at the same time having potentially valid moral reasons for being jealous of B (with respect to C): something which indicates irrational – for example, self-deceptive – rather than rational thinking.

To sum up, if my argument so far is on target, *jealousy* can most usefully be specified as the sort of envy where *A believes B* has got or is about to get some favour from a third party, C – a favour which A believes he deserves just as much or more than B. A is righteously indignant towards B because of B's undeserved good fortune, and specifically angry towards C as a violator of moral deserts. A is *concerned* about this state of affairs, and he desires that justice be done: namely, that A gets the deserved favour from C, while B does not get it (or is deprived of it if it has already been given).[25] Incidentally, if A also believes that B has used immoral methods to elicit the relevant favour from C (for instance, in a romantic context, by tempting C sexually although B knew that C was committed to A), A may be angry with

B in addition to being envious and indignant at *B*'s success, but that anger does not form part of *A*'s jealousy; it is a distinct, if co-existing, emotion. For even if the fault for the allegedly undeserved favouring lies entirely with *C*, and *A* knows *B* played no part whatever in securing it, *A* may be equally jealous (envious plus indignant) of *B*'s success.

Before putting this definition to the test by comparing it with other accounts, some further conceptual clarifications are in order. For *A*'s beliefs to be rational, it is necessary that *C* be the sort of being to whom agency and rational choice can be attributed. Incidentally, people have a tendency to posit such an agency even in cases where the relation seems to involve only two persons. This is why cases of indignant envy, such as (c), are relatively rare compared to jealousy. *A* will highly likely be tempted there not only to feel indignantly envious of *B* because of *B*'s undeserved serendipity but to feel anger towards Providence or personalised Luck, in which case the indignant envy has changed to a three-party relation, namely, jealousy: *A* is jealous of *B* with respect to *B*'s being undeservedly favoured by a certain *C* (however elusive). However, no condition of agency applies in the case of *B* which could be, for instance, an inanimate object: while sculptors are typically jealous of other sculptors, a sculptor (*A*) could easily be jealous of stalactites (*B*) in a nearby cave if more people (*C*s) were interested in seeing the stalactites than in attending the sculptor's exhibition.

On my definition, however, it must be the case that *A* at least has the conceptual equipment to be morally indignant and angry. To be sure, that condition probably excludes animal jealousy, as well as infantile jealousy, from consideration. But I do not see that as a weakness in my account, for in imputing jealousy to animals and infants we tend to commit a pathetic fallacy, endowing them with the mental capacity of mature people (see s. 1.3). It may be controversial at exactly what age one can ascribe a sense of moral desert to a child, but we must in general be careful not to confuse the observation that a small child behaves in certain ways *like* a jealous adult, with the claim that the child really *is* jealous. To react with distress at negative stimuli, such as at the frequent crying of a sibling in an adjacent cradle, who, additionally, also takes away from the first child the positive stimulus of the parents' attention, is not the same as having mastered the subtle intellectual apparatus that is required for a person to be able to experience jealousy.

5.2 Contrasting views

Much of the modern discussion of jealousy – what there is of it – focuses on the difference between jealousy and envy. A standard dictionary will tell you that while 'envy concerns what you would like to have but don't possess, jealousy […] concerns what you have and do not want to lose'.[26] This stock definition, of unknown origin, tends to obfuscate much of the conceptual

and substantive debate. For instance, in a recent study of jealousy in world literature, the author seems to have been lost in the etymological intricacies of the term 'jealousy' until she hit upon this 'sharp and helpful distinction' which from then on serves as the guiding-light of her research.[27] Ben-Ze'ev's extensive account of envy and jealousy can serve as an example of the more or less received conceptual wisdom. For him, envy involves a wish 'for something one does not have, while in jealousy it is something one fears losing'. More specifically, in jealousy we are afraid of losing our present favourable position in a unique human relationship to someone else and ending up in an inferior position. Thus, jealousy is 'more personal and generates greater vulnerability than envy'.[28] Jealousy does not, on such an account, involve verified knowledge of loss, but aims at maintaining the status quo.

One problem is that Ben-Ze'ev's definition limits envy to what I called in section 5.1 'coveting envy' and jealousy to 'grudging envy'. However, it is surely common for A to be (for instance, invidiously) envious of B because of something A has now but believes will soon be lost to B (for instance, the lead in a competition or status as the best student in the class); similarly nothing seems to prevent A from being jealous of B, with respect to C, because of something A has already lost or never had any hope of getting. A might, for example, be jealous of a fellow-student B's intelligence, with respect to God (C) who made A so dumb that A never had any chance of doing well in school. And what is more common than for a young man to experience pangs of jealousy after his girlfriend has irrevocably ditched him for somebody else? Interestingly enough, one of Ben-Ze'ev's own examples – albeit for him a borderline rather than a 'typical' case of jealousy – is of a man (Immanuel) brushed off by a woman he approaches (Ruth) who instead goes off with his best friend (Irving). There, clearly, Immanuel has lost something categorically, namely, his competition with Irving for wooing Ruth, but he has not lost a favourable human relationship that he already had, for it seems in the example that both friends had just met Ruth for the first time.[29] What is needed for jealousy is not a glimmer of hope, nor concern for the maintaining of any status quo, but simply A's belief in having deserved what B got or is about to get from C no less than B does. Verified knowledge of loss may even increase the intensity of the jealousy rather than rendering it obsolete. Crimes committed on grounds of jealousy are as typically directed against a rival, B, who has irrevocably won C over as against one with whom A is still seriously competing.

As to the 'more personal' nature of jealousy, it is not altogether clear what that means. If the point is simply that there is often a special valued attachment at stake between A and C, or that jealousy occurs more often than other kinds of envy in intimate sexual relationships, this might well be true. However, it is difficult to see in what sense scenario $(c)_1$ from section 5.1 is 'more personal' than, for instance, $(a)_1$. I would suggest that what makes $(a)_1$ and $(c)_1$ together perhaps 'more personal' than many (other)

kinds of envy is that they occur in the contexts of triadic relationships where C has decided to favour B rather than A (undeservingly or not). As soon as the third party enters into the relation, various additional considerations of equity and fairness start to emerge which do not apply in a dyadic context. The same reason might be invoked to explain the greater intensity of jealousy, as so often found in psychological research.[30] These findings could be interpreted as indicators of an important distinction between dyadic and triadic envy-relations rather than of a distinction between envy and jealousy. I do not have any academic evidence to back up this suggestion, but simply present it here as a conjecture, resting on the observation that some of the most intractable disputes in politics are, for instance, those which concern distributive justice – involving a distributor, such as the state, and two or more parties to which goods shall be distributed – rather than two-party face-to-face conflicts.

In view of the above considerations, the maintaining of the 'dictionary view' seems to hold out little prospect for making sense of the difference between envy and jealousy – or as I would put it: between jealousy and other kinds of envy. Therefore, it is somewhat disturbing to see it being presupposed by psychologists who are conducting research into the empirical differentiation of envy-experiences: research with potentially important educational implications. Psychologists are often blamed for their lack of concern with conceptual issues, if not outright conceptual laxity, and a much-quoted article by W. Gerrod Parrott and Richard H. Smith seems be a case in point.[31] Sceptical of earlier research findings, which had failed to identify any qualitative differences in the experience of envy and jealousy,[32] the authors decided to put to the test the 'traditional distinction' that envy 'occurs when a person lacks another's superior quality, achievement, or possession and either desires it or wishes that the other lacked it', while jealousy 'by contrast, necessarily occurs in the context of relationships […] when a persons fears losing an important relationship with another person to a rival'. In one experiment, where subjects were asked to recall an experience of either envy and jealousy, they received instructions to write a description of a situation in which they had felt either 'strong envy' or 'strong romantic jealousy'. In another experiment, different sets of stories involving typical envy in one set and romantic jealousy in another were presented to the subjects and they were asked to describe how the protagonists would have felt in the given situations. As it turned out, envy was characterised by feelings of inferiority, longing, resentment, and disapproval, while jealousy, by contrast, was characterised by fear of loss, distrust, anxiety, and anger.

Notice, however, the 'either' and the 'romantic' in the first experiment and the ready-made stories of envy *or* jealousy in the second. If it is taken for granted from the outset that a situation cannot be experienced as one involving both envy and jealousy, and also that the only, or at least the

prototypical, form of jealousy is of the romantic kind, then we need not be overly surprised about the 'remarkable extent' to which the differences described by the subjects corresponded to those proposed in advance by the theorists. The prophecy seems, to a large degree, to have been self-fulfilling, and the main conclusion of the research, that there really is a valid distinction between envy and jealousy along the old dictionary lines, foregone.

Moreover, when one of the two theorists in question, Parrott, produces elsewhere 'arguments' for distinguishing between envy and jealousy, they assume the following form: 'Envy occurs when another has what one lacks oneself, whereas jealousy is concerned with the loss of relationship one has. Jealousy concerns relationships with other people, whereas envy extends to characteristics and possessions', etc.[33] However, these are not 'arguments' in the relevant philosophical sense at all, let alone arguments of the form that I consider required for a conceptual methodology (s. 1.3). At best they constitute *argumentum ad verecundiam*: the logically illegitimate appeal to (textbook and dictionary) authority; at worst they are viciously circular. Arguments for including particular characteristics in the specification of a concept must include something more than a list of those very characteristics. Perhaps part of the trouble that many psychologists seem to have with concepts lies in their reluctance to admit that moral notions describe the world of evaluation rather than merely evaluate the world of description (see s. 1.3). That would, at any rate, explain the desperate search by scholars such as Parrott and Smith for a descriptive hard-facts difference between envy and jealousy which underlies any subsequent moral difference. To be sure, many philosophers could, from an opposite angle, be charged with conceptual rigidity (or even conceptual obsession), generating culpable lack of interest in the 'lived experience' of emotions such as jealousy, but that does not make the complaint levelled against the psychologists in question any less severe.

One more noteworthy aspect of the dictionary view of envy and jealousy is its emphasis on jealousy as a *threat*-response, central to which is *fear* of the loss of a possession (in particular fear of alienation of affections). Thus, a person's jealousy is always said to be tied to hope, for 'however hopeless her position may seem to an observer, the good is not yet wholly beyond her reach'.[34] Again, we are presented with a specification which to me, at least, seems thoroughly counter-intuitive. I have already given examples above of typical cases of jealousy where there is not any more, nor has there perhaps ever been, any *hope* on *A*'s part of receiving the relevant favour from *C*; yet *A* desires that things could have been different, as he would so richly have deserved. That is exactly why *A* is jealous of *B* (with respect to *C*). Also, as noted by M. J. Wreen, there is something murky about the *fear*-element of these analyses, for 'many a jealous, enraged husband is certainly afraid of nothing at all – and may well not "fear" any loss of love or sexual attention, but insist on it, when he catches his wife *in flagrante delicto*'.[35] Moreover, he may not only fear, but know, that his wife will not return to him.

Fear is a different emotion from jealousy. A husband's fear that his wife might cheat on him in the future is no more to be equated with jealousy than the fear that your team might lose tomorrow's match is to be equated with disappointment. It is not until the husband (*A*) starts to believe (however wrong-headedly) that his wife (*C*) has stepped out on him, or is about to do so, with *B*, or has at least treated *A* in some way unfairly qua husband vis-à-vis *B*, that *A* can become jealous of *B*. Prior to that, his fear that she might perhaps do so can prompt him to take various pre-emptive measures against possible jealousy-inducing situations – declining dinner invitations for himself and his wife if the host is too handsome, etc. – but again, fear of encountering a reason to become jealous is not the same as becoming jealous, although it may indicate that the person has a *disposition* to bouts of (perhaps irrational) jealousy. Similarly, our gold prospector, *A*, in (c) may have been suspicious of *B*'s extraordinary success long before he had any good reason to believe that their father (*C*) had short-changed *A*, and *A* may even have been jealous of *B* with respect to God or Providence – or to their father in the past. But it is not until his hunch changes from simple fear or suspicion into the belief that the father has in this particular case undeservingly favoured *B*, that *A* can become jealous of *B* with respect to their father, *C*, over this case. Thus, the distinction commonly found in psychological writings between 'suspicious jealousy' (when the relevant loss is unclear or only feared/suspected) and 'fait accompli' or 'reactive jealousy' (when the loss is unambiguous and damaging)[36] seems to lack rationale. Only in the latter case do we have real jealousy, as distinct from suspicion or fear. The dividing line between believing that *C* is about to start favouring *B* and fearing/suspecting that *C* might perhaps do so is admittedly thin, but it is not negligible. To take a parallel example, believing that my team is about to lose a match when it is 5–0 down and five minutes to go is not the same as fearing that it might lose it before the game starts, however prominent the opponent is. That people sometimes use the word 'jealous' to mean 'suspicious'[37] is no more an argument for considering a person on tenterhooks (episodically) jealous than the fact that people often call emulation 'envy' is an argument for emulation being a subclass of the emotion of envy.

Am I inconsistent in refusing to call fear of jealousy 'jealousy' while acknowledging earlier that a forward-looking deterrent shame (motivating us beforehand to steer clear of actions or emotions which will make us ashamed) is real shame rather than, as some theorists have suggested, merely fear of shame (see s. 4.1)? Not at all, for in forward-looking shame we do more than experience fear of what might happen if we follow a certain course of action or reaction; we are filled with shame at the prior identification of ourselves as possible (or even likely) perpetrators of shameful activity. Shame then becomes a motivation to avoid such activity. If no prior identification of this kind could take place (if we

were infallible with respect to the activity in question), we would avoid it not out of shame but rather because of some more elevated considerations. In 'suspicious jealousy', we are supposed to be jealous about something which we know has not (yet) taken place. Similar to forward-looking shame, we could be angry in advance with C who, as we know from previous experience, is a person likely to disfavour us with respect to B, and we could even be indignant of B's prospective success, which would then motivate us to do what we can beforehand in order to prevent C's favouring of B and the latter's 'success' becoming reality. However, the third element in jealousy is envy, and such envy requires, as is clearly formulated in Farrell's account, the belief that C seems to be favouring B (in respect r), rather than A.[38] Such a belief is, *ex hypothesi*, non-existent in 'suspicious jealousy'. Notice that A could easily be jealous of B not because C has favoured B as an individual, but because B belongs to a set of persons with certain characteristics that encourage C to favour them more than A; but such a case is still one of 'fait accompli' rather than 'suspicious' jealousy. Further, A could be *angry* with B for trying to tempt C to betray A (see s. 5.1), but anger is not, any more than fear of possible jealousy, the same as jealousy.

There is, I think, a twofold reason for the common conflation of suspicion and jealousy. First, some people with a strong disposition to jealousy really become irrationally jealous upon the first inklings of suspicion, for instance, upon seeing their spouse speaking intimately to another person. In such cases, however, A is jealous of B with respect to C not in virtue of the suspicion that C might start to favour B soon in some significant respect, but in virtue of believing, wrong-headedly,[39] that C is about to or has already started to do so. Second, even the most meticulous and systematic theorists, such as Ben-Ze'ev, sometimes seem to lose grip of the logical form of the jealousy-relation. 'It is told of Bertrand Russell, who had a long love affair with Lady Ottoline Morrell', Ben-Ze'ev says, 'that he was quite jealous of her and demanded she cease allowing her husband, Philip, access to her bed.'[40] Surely it was Philip, the rival, that Russell was jealous *of*, not Lady Morrell. For once, the dictionaries agree with me,[41] not to mention the most careful conceptual analyses of the emotion.[42] The fact that A is jealous of B, rather than C, is a conceptual, not an empirical claim. However, it does not answer the question of who is the 'main object' of jealousy. Ben-Ze'ev assumes that C is the main object, and A's attitude towards C what really matters in jealousy; perhaps this is the fundamental point at issue between his account and mine. However, if B is left out of the equation, A's supposed jealousy hardly distinguishes itself any more from mere anger at C (see s. 5.1). Putative empirical evidence showing that in jealousy A's feelings towards C are more intense than those against B would not change that fact. Neither would, conversely, findings of the opposite level of intensity suffice to marginalise C. Irrespective of any such

empirical findings, past or future, I do not consider it helpful to posit a certain party as the 'main object' of an emotion which is simultaneously directed at two persons. *B* is the one whose relative favouring *A* resents, through envy and indignation. *A* is also angry with *C* in an already-explained sense, but if *A*'s anger with *C* is not generated by the *very fact* that *C* favours *B* more than *C* should have, then *A*'s emotion towards *C* is not a constitutive part of jealousy; once the focus is completely removed from *B*, *A* is not jealous of *B* any more.[43] The problem for Ben-Ze'ev is that as soon as *B* is left more or less out of the definitional schema, the temptation arises to focus merely on *A*'s general attitude towards *C*, which can easily be one of suspicion and even possessiveness; and then the next step may be to confuse this attitude with jealousy, especially because a particular *A* with such an attitude will most likely have a strong disposition to jealousy.

But is there anything wrong with such a 'confusion'? One man's meat is another man's poison, and is Ben-Ze'ev not simply using a different terminology, dividing the conceptual terrain up in an alternative, but not necessarily less serviceable, way? Instead of my evaluative specification of jealousy as a compound emotion, he considers jealousy to relate prototypically to a person's fear of falling romantically out of favour with a mate. My answer will be, first, that his terminology is at least not more in accordance with ordinary usage than mine, leaving out or relegating to the sidelines, as it does, typical examples of jealousy as commonly identified in ordinary language: for instance, one pupil's jealousy of another when only the latter's piece of art is chosen for display by their teacher.[44] Second, my specification accounts for the reason why Ben-Ze'ev's 'jealous person', whom I would simply call suspicious, insecure, or possessive, would still often count as 'jealous' in ordinary discourse, namely in virtue of the (likely) above-mentioned *disposition* for (irrational) jealousy. Third, my account of jealousy as a compound emotion is helpful in distinguishing between jealousy and other structurally similar three-party emotions involving envy (invidious envy and angry envy), where the difference rests simply on the different *moral* focus, or the lack thereof, of the other emotions in the compound.

Farrell's analysis of jealousy avoids most of the pitfalls of the accounts considered so far. However, Farrell is as eager as the other writers to separate jealousy from envy, and this task is made difficult for him precisely because of his excellent grasp of the emotional landscape. He summarises his own position as follows in the second of three important papers:

> To be jealous is to be bothered or pained by the fact that, as we believe, we are not favored by others in some way in which we want to be favored (some other party apparently being so favored by those other people instead); to be envious is to be bothered or

pained by the fact that (as we believe) someone else has something that we want but do not have.[45]

Now, so far from pinpointing any radical difference between jealousy and envy, as was Farrell's intention, these definitions may be seen to indicate (correctly!) that jealousy is a kind of envy. To be sure, in envy we are bothered by our believing that someone else has something that we want but do not have; however, arguably, in jealousy that 'something' which 'someone else' has is precisely being 'favored by others in some way which we want to be favored'. Furthermore, if we add to Farrell's analysis the aspect of indignation over the undeservedness of the favour's passing us by, we solve the remaining puzzle at the end of his first paper. There, he finds it 'puzzling' why one should 'care so much about being favored in some way as to be able to be *hurt* by the fact that one is not thus favored'.[46] There is nothing puzzling any more about the intensity of this concern if we see it as being rooted in our desire for being treated by others in the way we deserve: surely one of the most deeply entrenched of all human desires. Indeed, Farrell has now modified his account of this 'puzzle' somewhat, although not in a completely satisfactory way, as I explain later (s. 5.3).

It is somewhat unclear why previous writers on jealousy have been so reluctant to admit that there is a moral concern central to it. In favour of a moral-concern view of jealousy is, for instance, the fact that in everyday conversation invidious envy is often *rationalised* in terms of jealousy: it is less painful to explain to ourselves or others that we resent *B*'s relative favouring by *C* because *B* does not deserve it as much as we do, rather than admitting, as might well be the case, that we simply (invidiously) envy *B* because of something *B* deserves as much as or more than we do. However, this common tendency for rationalisation, or sublimation, of invidious envy in terms of jealousy indicates precisely that ordinary people have, unreflectively, recognised that jealousy has something moral to recommend it. Other examples of the salience of moral beliefs in jealousy abound. It is said, for example, that if a Frenchman of high position (*C*) chose a woman (*B*) who was not his social equal as his mistress, his wife (*A*) would not be jealous; if however he chose someone of his own rank, intense jealousy would ensue.[47] Also, it is well-known that loss may be seen by *A* as non-humiliating, and not invoke *A*'s jealousy, if the party, *B*, receiving the given favour instead of *A* is clearly seen as standing 'above' *A* and hence more deserving of it.[48] In the first sort of case, *A* does not become jealous of *B* with respect to *C* because *B* is too *inferior* to *A* to rank as a potential rival, *B* is not in *A*'s league; in the second case, it is rather because *B* is too *superior* to rank as one. Thus, in neither case will *C* be considered to have violated *A*'s moral deserts, as the *B*s in question simply do not belong to *A*'s reference group.[49]

In spite of substantial anecdotal evidence, suggestions about the centrality of moral beliefs in jealousy have been almost unanimously denounced in the

literature. Perhaps the main reason is that the moral-concern view has hith-erto not been adequately formulated. Thus, Ben-Ze'ev is quite right in rejecting the view of Ortony and his colleagues who regard moral indignation as the central concern of *envy* in general.[50] Such a concern obviously plays no role, for instance, in invidious envy. Moreover, Neu and Wreen have convinc-ingly refuted the thesis that jealousy need refer, explicitly or implicitly, to moral rights.[51] I think, however, that Wreen goes a little too far when he says that a 'jealous man may realize both that he is jealous and that he has no moral claims against anyone', giving as example jealousy among the young and romantically unattached,[52] unless of course he means 'realise that he is irrationally jealous', but that is evidently not his point here. Nevertheless, if we understand 'moral claims' to refer exclusively to the upholding of moral rights, in the strict sense, Wreen is on the right track. And we must presume that this is what he means, or else he would not have been able to include *anger* in his specification of jealousy,[53] as anger implies the belief that you have somehow been wronged – although not necessarily through the viola-tion of a moral right. If, on the other hand, it were urged that jealousy is possible without any moral claims in the broad sense (including claims about moral deserts), anger and indignation would not only disappear as central concerns in jealousy, it would no longer be possible to distinguish between jealousy and invidious envy in three-party contexts, and the common tendency to rationalise the latter in terms of the former would be inexplicable.

While the criticisms made by Wreen and others may hit at previous versions of the moral-concern view, they leave my account of it untouched. What I suggested in section 5.1 was *not* that jealousy entails reference to the violation of moral *rights*, but rather to the violation of moral *deserts*. One can agree with Ben-Ze'ev that a husband who has continual love affairs may recognise his wife's right to have affairs as well, but still be jealous when she does.[54] Perhaps the husband self-deceptively believes that it is only proper for him but not for her to have affairs, although this belief does not form part of his reflective belief-system; or perhaps he even non-self-deceptively believes that although his wife also has a right to do so, it is in some way unfair to him that she should utilise it. In either case, his jealousy would probably count as irrational; an emotion is no less real for being irrational. Anyway, as we see in the next section, in matters of sexual love there is a lot of truth in the old saying, *amantes amentes*: lovers are lunatics.

Finally, let me distinguish my conceptual account of jealousy as a morally loaded notion from two distinct accounts which, in a sense, go further than I do by proposing that *all* envy has a desert or justice compo-nent. Somewhat paradoxically, after rejecting the view that there is a moral concern underlying all kinds of envy, Ben-Ze'ev suggests that the focus of concern in envy is 'our undeserved inferiority'. To dispel the apparent paradox, Ben-Ze'ev claims that there is an important distinction to be drawn between the moral domain and the domain of desert:

> The inequality associated with envy is often concerned with natural differences or with those arising from other impersonal causes. Since such inequality does not entail the immoral behaviour or attitude of an agent, there is usually no occasion to blame anyone for this situation. Nevertheless, the situation may still be considered undeserved or unfair […] We often envy lucky people or those born with natural gifts. In being envious toward those people we do not accuse them of behaving criminally or immorally, but rather consider ourselves to occupy an undeserved inferior situation.[55]

I think that Ben-Ze'ev's distinction here betrays an inadequate grasp of moral language. It is true that people are often envious of those considered to be extremely lucky. However, if the only rationale for envying the lucky is their luck, then the envy will count as invidious. As a Chinese proverb puts it, when the wagon of fortune goes well, envy and spite hang on to the wheels. On the other hand, once the reference to deserts enters in, the belief behind the emotion is question becomes a moral belief – be it in the end considered morally justified or not. All desert claims entail justice claims and, hence, belong to the moral domain. The point in making a desert claim about a state of affairs for which no agent is *causally* responsible is to bring it into the domain of *moral* responsibility: to claim that this state should be preserved if it is deserved, rectified if it is undeserved. Ben-Ze'ev may be quite right in that the concern in indignant envy (in two-party contexts) or jealousy is not (always) a 'general moral concern for justice', but rather a 'particular personal concern',[56] but the indignantly envious person is still making a moral claim, whatever his general concern with justice, in the same way as a man who complains about potatoes being stolen from his garden is expressing a moral grievance although he may happen to be too self-centred to worry much about the immorality of thefts in general.[57] Ben-Ze'ev is also right in noting that when we make desert claims, we are sometimes at a loss to find the agent to whom our blame can be imputed. But underlying such claims, as opposed to the mere grumbling over someone's serendipity, is still the conception that the world should not be like this: people should reap more in line with what they have sown, etc. And in default of a human being being held responsible, we usually manage to find a higher personalised force at which to direct our anger, which can occupy the role of *C* in a triad of jealousy – witness Ben-Ze'ev's own example of Salieri's (*A*) anger towards God (*C*) in bestowing superior musical gifts upon such an unworthy creature as Mozart (*B*) rather than on the more deserving Salieri himself.[58] Even when such a higher force is not posited, we make the desert claim in order to ascribe moral responsibility for the preservation or rectification of the given state of affairs, as noted above.

Richard H. Smith argues along similar, if somewhat less sophisticated, lines than Ben-Ze'ev's, that a person feeling envy 'will believe that the envied

person's advantage is to some degree unfair', although in the eyes of an 'objective observer' this belief 'will appear invalid'. Smith modifies this latter claim somewhat later by acknowledging that there may be cases where the envious person's sense of injustice 'borders on legitimacy',[59] but he does not so much as consider Aristotle's argument that indignation over someone's undeserved good fortune can be a moral requirement rather than a moral aberration. Rather than pressing that point here (see further in s. 5.4), let me simply remark against both Ben-Ze'ev and Smith that they seem to overlook the common occurrence of a person's not having the slightest desire to justify his envy morally to anyone. Not all invidiously envious people are prone to self-deceptive rationalisations or sublimations. There is nothing *conceptually*, as opposed to *morally*, wrong about *A*'s believing that a thing should ideally be taken from *B* and given to him without any moral reason (good or bad) – that is, about *A*'s envying *B* while accepting that *A*'s inferiority is deserved.[60] There need, thus, not be any moral component in envy; this is why we can call some envy 'invidious' in order to contrast it with 'indignant envy' (qua dyadic relation), 'jealousy' (qua triadic relation), and 'angry envy' (either qua dyadic or triadic relation), as I explained in section 5.1.

5.3 The peculiarities of sexual jealousy

Strangely enough, while real life abounds in cases of professional jealousy, jealousy in the classroom, sibling jealousy, and various other kinds, the examples chosen in the psychological and philosophical literature tend to be picked almost exclusively from the sphere of romantic or sexual jealousy. Part of the received wisdom about jealousy thus seems to be, as Ben-Ze'ev confidently states, that its 'prototypical instance' is romantic jealousy, with all the other kinds constituting 'borderline cases'.[61] In my own informal survey, mentioned in section 5.1, the majority of students chose examples from school settings: pupils' jealousy of one another. One possible reason might be that school bullying had received a lot of coverage in the local media in the preceding months, with jealousy of more successful and better liked pupils often being cited as a motive of the bullies. Nevertheless, my students' choice of typical examples casts some doubt on the priority of sexual jealousy, whether we think of it as priority in the order of conceptual analysis or simply, as seems to be Ben-Ze'ev's point, the order of commonality.

This alleged priority has had so much effect on theorists that in an important developmental study of children's jealousy, the two psychologists conducting it felt inclined to posit a special category of jealousy, so-called 'social-comparison' jealousy, to distinguish it from the more typical 'social-relations' jealousy involved in sexual relationships: an emotion which the children would not, for obvious reasons, be able to experience. In this study various possible jealousy-inducing stories were read to children and their responses recorded. The following story gives an example:

> Everyone was excited about the school fair. At the fair there would be games with prizes, food (like hot dogs, soda, ice cream, and cake), and toys and other things for sale. In art class the children drew posters to advertise the school fair. In Betsy's (Frank's) class the art teacher said that Betsy's (Frank's) and Kate's (Dan's) posters were colorful. But only Kate's (Dan's) poster was chosen to hang in the hall.[62]

Jealousy turned out, perhaps not too surprisingly, to be a common response to such comparison failure situations; or, as the two psychologists put it, 'social-comparison jealousy' emerged. What confounds me is how jealousy of any kind can fail to be socially comparative: what is at stake is always the relative favouring of *B* compared to *A* (as meted out by *C*). Also, I am at a loss to understand how the jealousy experienced by the children when putting themselves into Betsy's (Frank's) shoes could be described as anything other than 'social-relations' jealousy, as it surely involved beliefs about morally defective social relations between teachers and pupils in the classroom. The invoked distinction is clearly not in the interest of conceptual economy or clarity; indeed, it would hardly have been contrived by someone who was not already in the grip of a thesis about the priority of sexual jealousy.

Rosemary Lloyd, who studies jealousy from a literary perspective, also presupposes that all jealousy is 'based on love and aims at the possession of the loved object and the removal of the rival'.[63] However, at least she has the excuse that sexual jealousy is for the book-lover 'the most novelistic of circumstances, just as incest, according to Shelley, is the most poetic of circumstances'.[64] A literary critic can obviously be allowed more conceptual latitude than a psychologist or a philosopher. For Lloyd, it does not matter a whit academically whether the jealousy in question is well founded or not, as long as the 'potentially explosive and corrosive force' of the emotion as a literary strategy is explored and understood.[65]

I purposely took a different tack from the above scholars with my stories of the gold prospectors in section 5.1, for I believe that the over-emphasis on sexual jealousy may have had pernicious philosophical and psychological implications: blinding people to the possible justifiability of jealousy as an emotional response, and begging important questions in favour of the traditional cliché-ridden view of jealousy as an *ailment* to be discouraged in the young and despised in the old.

There is no denying the fact that sexually jealous people have commonly been held up as objects of public derision and ridicule. Even academic philosophers and psychologists have typically represented them as childish and immature persons who view their lovers as objects or commodities. The poor woman who remarked after walking in on her lover having breakfast with another woman: 'I would have killed her. Sitting there with *my* man, at

my table, eating *my* egg with *my* spoon',[66] could expect no more comforting a response from the average academic than being told: 'To be jealous is to be the capitalist pig of the heart: you're being possessive […] being politically incorrect.'[67] To put it a little less bluntly, for the sexual exclusivist, protectiveness of a relationship will also be protectiveness of the person concerned. But being protective of a person in such a way is also to be possessive of that person, that is objectifying him or her. Farrell's subtle observation that the jealous person cannot be viewing the unfaithful mate/lover (*C*) as *object*, since jealousy presupposes *C*'s capacity for rational choice,[68] would probably not cut much ice with a proponent of this view. Indeed, the proponent might point out that the jealous are defective precisely in that they want from their partners something that only *persons* can give, but regard them at the same time as something to be possessed, that is, as *objects*. Thus, the inconsistency inherent in the emotion is revealed:[69] the irrationality, if not the cloven hoof, of sexual jealousy. Is such jealousy not after all, the critic will ask, based on the demand that a (typically female) partner (*C*) obediently lower herself – to quote Kundera's *Life Is Elsewhere* – into the *aqua regia* of *A*'s love: 'that she immerse herself completely in his tub of love, that not a single thought stray elsewhere, that she be content to stay submerged beneath the surface of his words and thoughts, that she belong totally to his world, body and soul'?

For an emotion to count as justifiable, it must first be deemed *rational* and then, in addition, *morally fitting* in the given circumstances (see s. 1.4). Many writers of our age have seen jealousy as failing to pass even the first of these two hurdles, in view of the 'inconsistency' mentioned above. Moreover, for them, it would not mend matters to bring my reference to deserts to bear on the concept. They would point out that love is not a matter of will, something which can be given on demand. We cannot decide to love someone because we think that person deserves to be loved by us; we cannot make ourselves love someone because we feel we owe that person love.[70] A person's fear of spiders is irrational if the person *does* or *should* know that spiders are harmless creatures; similarly people's jealousy is irrational since they *do* or *should* realise that its cognitive basis does not bear scrutiny. There seems here to be something very true in Paul Eldridge's remark that (sexual) jealousy 'would be far less torturous if we understood that love is a passion entirely unrelated to our merits'.[71]

Appreciation of this truth about the nature of romantic love seems to be the motivating force behind Farrell's modification of his great 'puzzle', mentioned in the previous section, why people are so much hurt in jealousy by the fact that they are not favoured in the desired way. Farrell has now realised that only romantic jealousy, not *all* jealousy, is puzzling and problematic in this way, 'because it involves beliefs, say, or desires, or feelings, which strike us as odd when they have a romantic (or sexual content) but not when they have a non-romantic or non-sexual content'.[72] For instance, in

professional jealousy, as opposed to the romantic kind, there seems nothing odd about the desire for the relevant favour that needs to be present for such jealousy to occur, although we may of course still find the occasional overly strong affective response somewhat baffling.[73]

While I agree with Farrell's distinction between sexual and other kinds of jealousy, I still find his description of the remaining puzzle rather misleading. What he deems 'inappropriate' about sexual jealousy is the nature and the intensity of the *desires* it involves.[74] I would rather say that what is inappropriate there is the underlying *belief*. I see nothing curious about an intense desire for requited love – which is, after all, one of the most sought-after goals in human life – nor the desire, required for jealousy, to be treated in a deserving way. What is curious, however, is the belief that a person has treated you undeservedly through failing to love you romantically as much as another person, that is, being cut to the quick in virtue of an apparently unreasonable belief about unjust displacement: unreasonable because, as noted above, romantic love has by its very nature nothing to do with deserts.

Does this mean that all love is, in a way, arational and all sexual jealousy irrational? The most die-hard rationalist in the field of emotions might point out that people are no more *captives* of love than of their other emotions, and that love can be no less reasonable or unreasonable than, for instance, anger. The idea of love as an intense feeling which overpowers us would, on this view, be considered a vestige of nineteenth-century romanticism which does not tally with modern cognitive emotion-theory; rather, love should be seen as a rationally based existential decision, for which a person can be held morally responsible. But rather than taking a stand on such a radical suggestion here, let me instead shift the focus from *love* to intimate *relationships*.

We can assume, at least for the sake of argument, that love is a mysterious power which sweeps you off your feet and has nothing to do with reason or desert. This is an idea deeply embedded in our culture. However, there are also deep cultural assumptions about emotional fairness in intimate relationships. Once two persons have entered such a relationship, it is considered proper that they do things 'for' each other, make mutual sacrifices. Julian Pitt-Rivers claims that 'the admission of a quid pro quo represents an important watershed in a relationship because once the topic of justice is broached, it is difficult to rebuild the "innocence" of amiable (as opposed to legal) relationships'.[75] Now, I have tried but altogether failed to grasp what such a purely 'amiable' loving relationship would amount to, where each lover not only refrains from insisting on sexual exclusivity from the other but does not expect or demand *anything* from the other, in return for love. Would that be a real *loving* relationship between human beings, or would it rather, as I am inclined to think, be one better described as that of godly high-minded altruism? The problem for Pitt-River's view is that exclusive affiliation is typically valued from the very start of a loving relationship, and indications of complete indifference in this matter are likely to be

considered morally defective. To quote an example from David Buss, 'imagine that you started passionately kissing someone else at a party while your partner looked on, all the while not displaying the slightest sign of being upset. You would almost certainly wonder whether your partner really cared about you […] Absence of jealousy signals lack of love'.[76] It can hardly be our role as moral educators (see ch. 6) to inculcate such an attitude of romantic indifference in the young.

Maybe the idea of love as a zero-sum game ('If you love someone else, you must love me less') is a bogus one. Maybe also in an enlightened non-legal relationship the notion of mutual rights and obligations could be dispensed with. There is, indeed, something weird about creating an obligation, for example, through a promise or some other kind of consent, to experience and maintain romantic love. However, the very institution of a loving relationship involves its 'rules' and expectations of fairness, like any other institution. I am not here thinking of vows of fidelity or other promises people give to each other – for instance, on their wedding day – the violation of which would, after all, as such give rise to angry envy rather than jealousy. What I have in mind is rather that in a loving relationship you are morally expected to treat your partner justly and with respect, not to be unfaithful, etc. Perhaps *A*'s lover, *C*, never promised, or even so much as gave *A* to understand, that *C* would not sleep with others during their relationship, and thus violated no obligation (in a strict sense, see s. 5.1) with respect to *A* by doing so. But it does not follow that it is necessarily irrational of *A* to think that *C* owed *A* something and treated *A* in an undeserving way. That is, it is not necessarily *irrational* of *A* to be jealous. For though a loving relationship without obligations (in the strict sense) may be possible, one completely devoid of any expectations of commitment is not.[77] Such expectations can even be at work in *A*'s affair with a married person (*C*), witness Ben-Ze'ev's example of a woman who had a long affair with a married man, seemingly without having been jealous of his wife, but who immediately terminated the relationship upon finding out that she was not *C*'s only mistress.[78]

Once we turn our attention to the difference between *obligations* and reasonable *expectations* of justice, a host of interesting considerations emerges that I have explored in detail from a different perspective elsewhere,[79] and will not pursue further here. Let it suffice to say that the fact that *C* has not violated any (prima facie) obligation in erecting an obstacle to *A*'s wishes does not necessarily mean that *C* cannot be held morally responsible for the creation of the obstacle. In the context of sexual jealousy, however, the justification of such an emotion would have to rest on the *C*'s having violated *A*'s reasonable expectations of just treatment in a loving relationship rather than on the mere fact that *C* did not love *A* romantically or, possibly, stopped loving *A*.

I should not be understood as suggesting that sexual jealousy is typically

a rational response. Apart from the frequent unreasonableness of the underlying desert claims (especially amongst the young and unattached), there is every reason to believe that what the poet Young called 'jealousy's peculiar nature' to 'swell small things to great, nay, out of nought' is nowhere as often or amply demonstrated as in romantic relationships. I am here thinking of cases where *A* becomes jealous on insufficient grounds, like the husband who immediately drew the conclusion that his wife had been cheating on him when she came home late from work (s. 1.4).[80] All too often, the jealous lover 'wanders through a labyrinth whose walls are covered with hieroglyphics, projecting over and over again in his or her mind the image of something half heard or half seen, rewriting the past, sucking the fruit of experience for every last drop of sensation'.[81] The least we can say, at the end of this section, is that it is unwise to present the commonly distorted lens of sexual jealousy as a paradigm of jealousy in general. However, despite the singularities and peculiarities of the former, its occurrences in loving relationships are not *always* doomed to fall short of the requirements for the rationality of jealousy as an emotional response. Indeed, I agree with David Buss that, properly used, sexual jealousy can strengthen commitment and enrich relationships.[82]

As a final point, nothing in what I have said so far explains the common assumption that sexual jealousy is logically and/or empirically prior to other forms of jealousy. One might conjecture, perhaps, that this 'primacy' is not unrelated to the fact that the jealousy-expressing outpourings of Othello and the jealousy-inducing escapades of Don Giovanni are more 'novelistic' and immediately engaging for the average adult than the plight of poor Betsy who failed to have her poster displayed at the school fair. But another and more important reason, I suspect, is that the priority assumption is often caused by conceptual sloppiness. 'Sexual jealousy' is thus frequently used as an umbrella term for all kinds of emotional romantic upsets: *A* may be terribly *sad* and *disappointed* that *C* spurned *A*'s advances and opted for a romantic liaison with *B* instead, and even when *A*'s emotion is not based on any beliefs about the lack of justice involved (that is, indignation towards *B* and anger towards *C*), many people will tend to describe *A* as suffering from pangs of 'jealousy' – the infamous 'green-eyed monster'. Although this way of speaking exhibits an unfortunate confusion of distinct emotions, it is somewhat understandable in light of two facts: first, that *A* is also in this case *hurt* by *C*'s decision (although 'hurt' does not here, as it does in jealousy, have any moral connotations), and, second, that the 'feels' of different emotions can be phenomenologically indistinguishable (see s. 1.2) – a fact which seems not yet to have been borne in on the general public. *A* may feel as equally wretched when merely saddened by *C*'s decision as when jealous towards *C*'s more successful suitor, and the affective 'symptoms' may be exactly the same as in jealousy, even though the underlying beliefs, and hence the emotions, are radically different.

5.4 Jealousy as a virtue

My analysis of jealousy in section 5.1 brought out how jealousy can in many cases be warranted as a *rational response*. As long as *A* has a good reason to believe that the treatment received from *C* was undeserved, as compared with *C*'s treatment of *B*, *A*'s jealousy will count as rational, at least as far as the cognitive part of the emotion is concerned. The conative part presents no puzzle either. It is a well-known fact about human beings that they typically become concerned when they are treated unjustly in an area which is important to their self-worth, that is, to their self-respect and self-esteem. Many can bear adversity but few contempt; and as Nozick has, for instance, convincingly argued, self-esteem is competitively based: we evaluate our success or failure by comparing ourselves with others.[83] This must not be understood to mean that retaining self-worth is primarily a matter of 'keeping up with the Joneses'; people can, at any given time, live by strict principles laid down by their self-respect without worrying too much about whether their peers are doing better or worse than them. In order to grasp, however, what realistic standards of self-respect are and what counts as a reasonable ratio of accomplishments to expectations, a person must first look to the world outside for data, to facts about human potentialities, efforts, and successes. It is on these grounds, then, that the possible rationality of jealousy may be explained. *A*'s jealousy may well be based on true or warranted beliefs about *C*'s undeservingly favouring *B* and disfavouring *A*, together with normal concern for *A*'s own self-worth as compared to others. The previous section brought to light that even romantic jealousy, despite its apparent irrationality, is also in a certain sense (as part of a loving *relationship*) amenable to rational considerations of this kind.

It is impossible to find societies without jealousy,[84] but nevertheless situations in which the emotion arises are in part relative to time and place: to the prevailing ideas of what constitutes the self-worth of an individual in the given society. In Mediterranean societies, for instance, people have tended to be extremely sensitive to pride and shame in matters concerning sexual fidelity – witness the famous Italian *cornuto* – whereas transgressions of that kind may have been viewed more lightly in liberal France. Generally speaking, however, when a social system is designed without sufficient regard for the competitive nature of self-esteem, it is liable to collapse, as happened in the famous case of Mormon polygamy: a system which broke down not only as a result of outside pressures but also owing to its inadequate respect for the problems of female status within the household.[85]

But while jealousy does not necessarily fail the test of *rationality*, at a personal or a societal level, its occurrence might nevertheless always indicate *moral failure*. Recall that for an (episodic) emotion to count as justifiable, it must not only be rational, but also *morally fitting* to the circumstances (see s. 1.4); it must, as Aristotle stressed, not be felt too much or too little, and it

must be experienced at exactly the right time 'about the right things, towards the right people, for the right end, and in the right way'.[86] As soon as we go wrong with respect to one of these parameters, the relevant emotion is no longer the 'intermediate and best condition'.[87] In other words, although an emotional response passes the rationality hurdle, it may still be one that should for some reason always remain *morally* subordinate to other more salient considerations, in which case the response will be morally unjustifiable in the end, and it will be incumbent on each and every one of us to train ourselves against its onslaught. In order to pursue this issue further, we must next ask whether this applies in the case of jealousy: that is, whether jealousy is invariably out of balance with other morally appropriate reactions and, hence, morally reproachable in all contexts.

Let me propose that this is far from being the case, and that jealousy serves in many cases as an insignia of admirable self-respect, healthy pride, and that sense of justice which is a necessary feature of a person's sound moral outlook. My arguments for this claim in what follows will not come as much surprise to those familiar with Aristotle's discussion of the virtue that he calls *mildness* (of temper). Aristotle realises that capacity for *anger* is a necessary element of true mildness, that is to say, as long as one avoids extremes and follows the golden mean. Total lack of this capacity will, on the other hand, be seen as a moral fault:

> The deficiency [of anger] – a sort of inirascibility or whatever it is –
> is blamed, since people who are not angered by the right things, or
> in the right way, or at right times, or towards the right people, all
> seem to be foolish. For such a person seems to be insensible and to
> feel no pain. Since he is not angered, he does not seem to be the sort
> to defend himself; and such willingness to accept insults to oneself
> and to overlook insults to one's family and friends is slavish.[88]

It is often taken for granted that with regard to emotions of bad reputation, desirable emotional change, which is to be encouraged through moral education, necessarily involves the cooling down or extinguishing of emotion. Aristotle concedes that the mild person will 'err more in the direction of deficiency';[89] he will regard inirascibility rather than (excessive) irascibility as the less destructive of the two extremes. Nevertheless, as Aristotle's discussion implies, in the case of justified anger, increased moral understanding might make you *more angry* than before, being more sensitive to how deeply you have been insulted. An intense occurrence of anger, for instance, when people rouse themselves to shake off the yoke of a despot, has indeed always been considered – as Alexander Bain confidently stated centuries later – 'not unbecoming in the greatest and most high-minded of men'.[90]

What Aristotle says about anger can arguably be related, *mutatis*

mutandis, to jealousy in a perfectly straightforward way, and that is what I propose to do. Not just 'any chance person' deserves any given kind of good; or as Aristotle puts it, 'there is a kind of analogy and propriety' in such things.[91] Now, of course, Aquinas later declaimed against this view, pointing out that grieving over another's good 'because he who happens to have that good is unworthy of it' is improper according to the teachings of faith, since 'temporal goods that accrue to those who are unworthy, are so disposed according to God's just ordinances'.[92] However, from the secular Aristotelian-cum-Millian perspective adopted in the present book, it seems reasonable to suppose that jealousy can properly be felt by *A*, other things being equal, when *B* receives from *C* a favour that *A* deserves more than, or at least as much as, *B* (although it will, as always, remain a matter for further moral consideration in each particular instance whether the emotion shall be left unexpressed or acted upon). It is not only that in such cases *A*'s jealousy is *non-vicious*; it can even be seen as exemplifying a *moral virtue* – that is, if we define a virtue (à la Aristotle) as a character trait a human being needs to flourish and live well. Jealousy qua virtue (2) would then constitute a mean between two vices: (1) too much sensitivity to undeserved treatment which overshadows other appropriate responses, such as forgivingness, benevolence, etc., and (3) too little sensitivity to such treatment which is the sign of excessive magnanimity toward others or servile sheepishness. Persons guilty of (1) are too quick to make mountains out of molehills; those guilty of (3) make themselves sheep by stomaching any undeserved treatment. Thus, neither of the two lead lives of *eudaimonia*.

To substantiate this claim, we need to focus particularly on the alleged deficiency (3), the lack of capacity to become jealous, which many people would be inclined to view as the moral virtue in question rather than (2). It is tempting to see in those who have high-mindedly overcome the tendency to become jealous the appearance of moral superiority – of standing above the fray – but such an appearance is, I maintain, seriously misguided. To explain why, let us recur momentarily to the value of pridefulness. Prideful persons *believe* that their lives should ideally be both filled with pride but devoid of shame, and that they are entitled to external recognition of their merits and achievements – and they are deeply *concerned* with the realisation of these beliefs. I have argued (s. 4.1) that pridefulness has both a moral and psychological value: *moral* in guarding and upholding self-respect, *psychological* in laying the foundation for personhood. I have mainly discussed jealousy so far as an episodic emotion, but of course qua potential moral virtue, jealousy will be the *disposition* to experience the correct mixture of anger, indignation, and envy in the right circumstances. In order to argue, as I have already suggested, that justified jealousy is a necessary condition of pridefulness, it is essential that we consider the moral and psychological ramifications of the contrasting option (3): 'making oneself a sheep'.

To uphold and preserve one's self-respect, one must take it seriously;

defend it if necessary. Recall that self-respect encompasses those fundamental principles by which one has chosen to live. After taking a cue from Aristotle, we decided in chapter 3 to ignore non-morally-imbued principles. What the remaining moral principles specifically involve can, however, be left out of consideration here; the important point is that for those principles to count as the mainstay of our self-respect, we must take pride in them and refuse to let others meddle with them. We must, so to speak, respect our own self-respect. Even our pusillanimous 'whiners' from section 3.1, who constantly feel that they are falling short of their own expectations and are vitally lacking in self-esteem, must continue to value themselves as bearers of principles; as owners of large jars of self-respect, however little liquid there happens to be inside them. Otherwise, the 'whiners' are no longer self-respectful; otherwise they have collapsed into the adjacent character-type – the spineless 'shit-eaters' who are lacking in both self-esteem *and* self-respect. To respect oneself as the bearer of principles, and to respect those principles, implies that one resents having one's principles disrespected and violated: one both feels the sting of such disrespect – for instance, through indignation and anger – and is ready to do something about it. This is why, as Aristotle said, 'the servile, the worthless, and the unambitious are not given to indignation, for there is nothing of which they regard themselves as worthy';[93] that is, they are totally lacking in self-respect.

Now, a person (*A*) who does not feel the kind of resentment that I have shown to be characteristic of jealousy, upon being undeservedly disfavoured by *C* vis-à-vis *B*, seems to be somehow lacking in vital sap. Not only that, it is hard, if not impossible, to imagine self-respect made up of moral principles and goals which does not include serious concern about being undeservedly discriminated against in ways which give rise to (justified) jealousy: a person without such concern is no better than a sheep whose self-respect is eaten by the wolves. Self-respect may not demand the making of a scene in a situation of this kind,[94] but it surely demands the emotional response: 'Nobody should treat me like this; *B* should not have gotten that favour from *C*, I should!' In other words, what is needed is some kind of a moral *protest*, be it expressed openly or not. An alternative emotional response would be to experience sadness and wallow in self-misery, but as Bernhard Boxill has convincingly argued, mere whining is not enough to maintain self-respect and know oneself as self-respecting; it is only through refusing to pocket insults and protesting one's wrongs that a person displays self-respecting concern.[95] A completely non-jealous person fails, like the overly forgiving one, to take his or her projects and entitlements seriously enough; a failure which, as David Novitz argues in the case of the overly forgiving one, 'may well signal a willingness to condone what is immoral'; it is a vice, a 'character-flaw'.[96]

The lack of readiness to make claims, the lack of a rich enough self-view to insist upon fair treatment vis-à-vis 'rivals', is what morally incapacitates

and targets for further discrimination and mistreatment the completely non-jealous person – who thus becomes, at best, a suitable candidate for some sort of assertiveness training, that is, as long as the sheepishness is a moral rather than a pathological problem. This distinction between the morally defective and the pathological is salient here, for, interestingly enough, there also exists a medical symptom called 'pathological tolerance', characterised by the inappropriate acceptance of a triangular relationship by the member of a primary sexual dyad who is of the same sex as the 'triadic addition'.[97] But such an ailment probably calls for more drastic measures than a Dale Carnegie course on assertiveness can provide.

The thrust of my argumentation so far is that jealousy cannot morally be neglected with impunity. The lack of capacity for jealousy implies lack of concern for self-respect; and indeed, this kind of lack is precisely the kind which I described earlier as want of pridefulness, want of concern with the external positive recognition of and respect for (including, naturally, the non-violation of) one's principles. If pridefulness is necessary for self-respect in the way that I have argued, and jealousy is necessary for pridefulness, then jealousy is also necessary for self-respect. Notice that these are moral arguments relating to the upholding of the agent's own moral character; one might also adduce arguments of a more social nature, such as psychological evidence showing how people only come to realise their own faults upon witnessing other people's 'negative' emotional reactions,[98] or considerations of how abolishing all forms of jealousy implies abolishing all forms of interdependence which are the core of intimate relationships[99] – but such arguments will not be pursued here. Let me, instead, turn to the second facet of my earlier argument for the value of pridefulness: its role in the formation and sustenance of personhood, and how lack of justified jealousy undermines this role.

The second reason why someone who is a 'servile sheep', who is incapable of jealousy, cannot be leading a life of *eudaimonia* is that he or she cannot in any coherent sense be considered a real *person*. A person must *at least* be someone who can make and acknowledge claims, and can be the object of and can reciprocate positively and negatively evaluating emotions.[100] The 'sheep' is incapacitated in an important sense qua moral decider because it lacks the repertoire to react emotionally in an appropriate way to undeserved disfavouring. The sheep cannot consider itself the equal of others, but rather has a slavish attitude towards itself, just like Aristotle's inirascible man. 'Slavish' means for Aristotle (given his view of slaves' nature) 'bereft of humanity',[101] and this is precisely what gives point to Stocker's earlier-cited remark about a person who only experiences 'positive emotions' somehow not being 'a person like us' (see s. 1.4). Lack of the capacity to feel jealousy is, thus, not only a *moral* fault but a *psychological* one as well. This will not come as any novelty to those who accede to the earlier argument about jealousy as a necessary ingredient in pridefulness, for lack of

pridefulness implies lack of personhood. The very idea of my own self as distinct from, but still essentially the same kind of self as, those of others derives from the possibility of evaluating my self as equal, superior, or inferior to theirs (see s. 4.1), but this possibility is in an important sense ruled out in the case of persons who do not experience jealousy when they should.

If all of this is true, why has jealousy typically been saddled with a bad name? Perhaps some of its bad reputation can be explained by the fact that what people call 'jealousy' (in a dispositional sense) is sometimes the extreme (1), the vice of excess, rather than the mean (2), which I regard as a virtue. Such vagaries of language are no mystery: there are other common examples of the same word being both the name of a potential vice and a potential virtue ('anger', 'love', 'pride', etc.).[102] Furthermore, 'jealousy' is often used to refer primarily, if not exclusively, to sexual jealousy which, as we saw in section 5.3, often falls short of the requirements of rationality. More confusingly, however, 'jealousy' is sometimes used in ordinary language to denote unreasonable fearfulness or suspicion: usage which leads to conceptual sloppiness, as I pointed out in section 5.2, and should be avoided.

My above justification of jealousy must be distinguished from a more restricted defence, recently offered by Peter Goldie. He argues that jealousy can be a character trait 'which it is appropriate to consider valuable for a particular person to possess'. Even apparently negative or insignificant traits can 'resonate through a person's psyche in such a way', according to Goldie, that their removal will have 'dramatic and unforeseen consequences for the whole person'; they cannot simply be taken away with impunity like malignant tumours. So, a moral assessment of a person's jealousy must depend upon 'how this disposition is bound into and blends with the rest of his personality'. For certain kinds of persons, well-grounded and proportionate jealousy may well be an appropriate goal to aim at. Goldie's 'defence' must be understood in the context of his more general personalised, 'holistic' view of emotions as states which must always be 'assessed as part of a person's overall character', that is, in the light of a certain personal 'narrative structure'.[103] What Goldie has tried to do is to justify jealousy as a necessary ingredient in a coherent set of attitudes, thoughts, and feelings of a certain character type; my justification has the much more ambitious aim of justifying jealousy in the life of an ideally virtuous character type, such as Aristotle's *megalopsychos*, and hence as a moral goal at which to aim for all those who are concerned with living without vice.

More objections might (and probably will) be pressed against my accounts of justified jealousy as a virtue than I have time to consider here. A tree is best known by its fruit, and I believe that both my conceptual and my moral accounts of jealousy – my *positive argument*, that is – yields more digestible fruit than previous theories. Nevertheless, let me consider here at the end two critical objections, which I shall call the *objection of meanness* and the *objection of malice*.

166

Someone might argue, first, that irrespective of any desert claims, it is always mean or vicious – that is to say, inconsistent with moral virtue – to be susceptible to resentment (of whatever *source*) at the thought that another has something one wants but does not have, and hence that it is reasonable to think less (morally) of a person for being so disposed.[104] My answer to this objection of *meanness* is simple enough. Let us conduct a thought experiment involving two worlds: one in which limited resources are divided fully according to merit; another where more plentiful resources are divided such that only the undeserving have more than in the first world. Unless persuaded, as was Aquinas, by 'the teachings of faith', a person of moral virtue might, reasonably, be outraged enough by the second option to opt for the first world. There need not be anything mean about good and honest people loathing injustice to the point that they would prefer the undeserving to be deprived of their rewards even if it meant that the deserving would not get them instead, but rather that the total share of goods would be reduced. I disagree with Ben-Ze'ev who claims that there 'can hardly be moral justification' for the desire to deprive others of benefits if it means depriving oneself of some benefits as well.[105] Such a justification can, for example, be forthcoming on utilitarian grounds. Requirements of justice are highly important in preserving the moral order of the world, and accepting the overridingness of those in many cases to other moral considerations consolidates rather than undermines my declared utilitarian standpoint, since for a Millian utilitarian, requirements of justice stand collectively higher in the scale of utility than any others (recall s. 2.3).

Second, an objector might argue that what I have ended up defending is not really jealousy as the compound emotion laid out in section 5.1, but only two separate parts of it, namely, *anger* (towards *C*) and *indignation* (towards *B*). It may well be necessary for *A*'s self-respect and status as a person that *A* is able not only to stand up for fair treatment and to resent being treated by *C* in an undeserving way, but also to feel indignation towards an object of undeserved favouring (*B*). The objector might even grant, at least for the sake of argument, that such indignation is not, in principle, bound to collapse into meanness or viciousness. But why can the morally and psychologically valuable function of what I have called 'jealousy' not be served by these emotions alone;[106] why do I need to bring the 'wholly nasty'[107] envy-part into the compound as well? It is one thing to experience abstract moral indignation towards persons as 'objects of undeserved favouring'; it is quite another to desire, as the envy-part implies, that the good in question be, ideally, taken away from a particular individual *B* and given to *A* without regard to *B*'s feelings, interests or wants, and to be pleased if that happens. Such an emotion smacks of ill-will – personal malice – and cannot be morally defended.

Notice first that what the objector is zooming in on and rejecting is neither invidious envy, as I specified it in section 5.1, nor *Schadenfreude*,

pleasure at undeserved misfortune. What the objector complains about is rather that my specification of (justified) jealousy includes an element of envy which, in turn, incorporates moral disregard for a specific person, where such disregard can only be explained as malicious, and prospective pleasure in B's (sought-after-by-A) loss[108] – an emotional attitude that is in the end scarcely less woeful than invidious envy.

My answer to this objection will be to point out that in a case of jealousy, such as (c)$_1$ in section 5.1, it is not at all necessary that A feels overall resentment against B. A may still on the whole love and cherish B as his brother, although he resents him in this particular case because of the fact of B's relative favouring by their father. We must bear in mind that in jealousy A is concerned that B does not come into possession of the desired favour or that he is deprived of it if he has already received it. This concern must be strong enough to outweigh any concern, relating to the favour in question, about B's interests or will. That is, in jealousy A must simply resent B to the extent of becoming totally indifferent towards B's wishes concerning the relevant favour. If the resentment is stronger than this, it is neither required (for jealousy) nor justifiable as part of jealousy; then and only then can we refer to it as 'malice' or 'ill will'. However, since the 'minimal resentment' required is simply an implication of A's desire to alleviate unworthy success, a desire that I have already justified in my reply to the first objection and to which Aristotle fittingly refers as the sign of a 'good character',[109] I believe that I have also shown why jealousy as a compound emotion (including the envy-part) can be justified.

Let me make it clear that my justification of the personal resentment required for jealousy is much weaker than Wendell Stephenson's recent defence of resentment as a form of ill will. Stephenson's 'resentment' is or implies a desire that the other *suffer* in some way, that the person be de-exalted or humiliated, ultimately being brought to a state of repentance or contrition:

> To render one's injurer mindful, or to see him rendered mindful, is to impose something on one's injurer, to subject him to a certain unwanted, unpleasant, or undesirable experience or discipline. Hence […] it is to inflict suffering on him, and to want to inflict this sort of thing on him (or to have it inflicted on him) is to want him to suffer.[110]

By contrast, the resentment required for the envy-part of jealousy does not aim at B's repentance (if anyone should repent, it is C), let alone B's humiliation or suffering. It merely involves disregard for B's wishes – but of course for a good moral reason, which distinguishes this disregard from either the total indifference or the (less typical) *Schadenfreude* that I described as an element in invidious envy in section 5.1. If A's aim were, however, directly to

let *B* suffer, and to take pleasure in that suffering, then talk of a 'wholly nasty' emotion might not be as morally far-fetched any more.

In this chapter I have attempted to strike at the roots of a deeply entrenched dogma about the necessary rational and/or moral inappropriateness of jealousy. My point has not been that jealousy is a tough weed to eradicate, as previous writers have reluctantly admitted, but rather that it is not to be eradicated at all if we are to lead a good and balanced life: to retain our self-respect and even personhood. More generally speaking, wanting to expunge the emotion of jealousy from our moral repertoire betrays an inadequate understanding of the value of pridefulness for the good life. Perhaps it is true, as F. Berenson claims, that 'jealousy is never a pleasant emotion';[111] but neither is anger, nor even compassion, that prototype of a 'positive' emotion. Anyway, what should be aimed at in our lives is not the immediately pleasing but rather the deep and fecund pleasures of a harmoniously virtuous life.

6

TEACHING EMOTIONAL VIRTUE

6.1 Educating emotions

The prevailing cognitive view of emotions, that is the view of emotions as states of experience which are, in principle, penetrable to reason and amenable to coaching, has obvious educational implications. One need not be a Deweyan to appreciate the fact that, at least in the area of the emotions, the most important philosophy will be philosophy of education.[1] When combined with recent trends in general theories of moral education, where a somewhat pessimistic approach derived from Kohlberg's pioneering research (see s. 6.2)[2] has started to give way after having held sway more or less unchallenged for a long period, one would expect the positive cultivation of young people's emotions to occupy a prominent place on educational agendas, and moral education as a whole to be undergoing both a reshuffle and a revival. However, in spite of some recent enthusiasm about ideas of 'emotional intelligence' and 'multiple intelligences', to which I briefly attend below, the truth is that one still has to search hard to find books on education and articles in leading education journals that consider emotions seriously or, as C. Beck and C. D. Kosnik remark, 'even light-heartedly',[3] and those few that do have somehow been sidelined (academically and/or geographically) from mainstream discussions about the fundamental goals of education.[4]

The present chapter may be seen as an attempt to redress this imbalance somewhat. In this section I start with some general observations about the formation and regulation of emotions, followed in section 6.2 with a critical overview of the most common misgivings – or, as I would prefer to call it, 'myths' – about the unfeasibility, at least in school settings, of moral education in general and emotion education in particular. Section 6.3 constitutes a survey of some of the possible teaching methods, the didactics, of such education, and finally section 6.4 addresses the tutelage of those emotions which have formed the core of the present book: pride and jealousy.

My concern here is not that of the glum moralist, looking for a 'corrective' to mounting youth delinquency, or a 'cure' for emotionally impoverished

children who, with increasing regularity (or so we are told), wreak havoc on their schools and communities. It may be true that nowadays young people are drawn earlier into the maelstrom of adult experiences than they used to be, and that they mature more quickly for better *and* for worse, but I have little sympathy with the common rueful nostalgia for a lost world of harmonious families and idyllic schools. In spite of everything, I consider the century which has just passed to be one of general moral progress, with more people than ever before, including *young* people, showing humanitarian concern for, and attention to, the needs of their neighbours.[5] Perhaps the reason is primarily economic: more people can *afford* to be altruistic than ever before in history. Be that as it may, my intention in turning to issues of moral education is not to help stem a trend towards increased immorality and emotional callousness, but rather, as an indomitable believer in the 'Enlightenment Project' (see s. 1.1), to facilitate the current trend towards increased moral enlightenment. That can, I think, be done with the aid of theories, both old and new, about moral and emotional growth.

Moral education, including character and emotion education, formed a core element of ancient and medieval educational programmes, both in theory and in practice. On the heels of those came the ideals of *character education*, prominent in nineteenth- and early twentieth-century American and European educational thought. An integral part of those programmes was the regulation of the experience, or at least the expression, of emotion. However, towards the middle of the twentieth century, character-education ideals started to fall on evil days, partly because of the growing disillusionment with grand moral and political ideals in general, partly because of the corrosive effect of precisely one such grand ideal which gradually took captive the Western (in particular, the American) educational world: liberal pluralism.[6] Suddenly, educational institutions could make a virtue of what would previously have been considered a vice, namely, steering clear of issues of character formation; shrinking, to use a Nietzschean phrase, from the task of educating humans to be human.[7] The result was the one that I have already described as teacher neutrality and parental uncertainty on moral values (s. 2.1). Educating the young to have morally justifiable moral beliefs and emotions was, at best, replaced by helping them to 'clarify' the values that they already had.

Quite a lot has already been said in this book about the shortcomings of the liberal attitude, and I am not quite finished with the subject, as the following section will attest. But first let us resume the thread of argument from section 1.4 which focused on the inescapable link between moral evaluation and moral responsibility. Deep questions still remained at that point about the extent to which we could be the creators of our own characters. It emerged that in order to be held responsible for our dispositions, including our dispositions to experience particular emotions, their operations must, if not presently then at least at some earlier time, have been

under our voluntary control. But how is that possible? Recall that the upsurge of cognitive theories of emotion cannot be understood independently of the simultaneous rediscovery and reappraisal of Aristotelian ideas of moral education, in particular the education of human virtues, and Aristotle has a pretty clear answer to the question of voluntary control in general and emotional agency in particular.

As already noted, virtue for Aristotle is about both actions and emotions. These receive praise or blame when they are voluntary, pardon, sometimes pity, when they are involuntary.[8] Virtue, as other character traits, arises through *repeated practice*: we become just by performing just acts; we grow a disposition to invidious envy if we indulge in such envy often enough. The unjust or invidiously envious may not be able to get rid of these traits *now*, but they are still responsible for them since it was *originally* open to them not to acquire such a character.[9] But what is meant by saying that to be just, we must first do just actions? If we do what is musical, we must already be musicians. In the same way, if we choose what is just, must we not already be just?[10] How do we *start* cultivating these virtues – simply on a whim? This objection is invoked as a rhetorical question by Aristotle himself, and his answer to it is very much to the point. Cultivation of the virtues starts by *habituation*: 'It is not unimportant, then, to acquire one sort of habit or another right from our youth; rather, it is very important, indeed all-important.'[11] However, if this is so, are we really responsible for our character traits after all? Are they not attributable to our parents and other educators, who train us in youth to acquire the right or wrong habits, and hence beyond our control?

It may be instructive at this point to quote Pindar:

> But human excellence
> grows like a vine tree
> fed by the green dew
> raised up, among wise men and just,
> to the liquid sky.

As we saw in section 4.2, Aristotle is well aware of the vulnerability of human life, its fragility.[12] People such as our Hitler-*Jugend* officer from section 1.4 are never likely to acquire the virtues necessary for *eudaimonia*. Their fate will be like that of a vine tree, fed not by 'green dew' but weed-killer. However, Aristotle is not considering or addressing brainwashed people, people systematically inculcated with vicious beliefs, or imbeciles. His audience comprises normal, autonomous persons who have enjoyed average or better upbringing. Such persons not only acquire a whole gamut of virtuous dispositions through habituation; equally importantly, they also grow their own *practical reason*: the capacity to evaluate and choose between courses of action. Gradually, external conditioning plays a less significant

role in their character-formation; more and more dispositions become established as a result of their own deliberations and choices. Simultaneously, they also become capable of reassessing and gradually refining those traits with which they were originally inculcated.

Thus, 'we are ourselves in a way jointly responsible for our states of character', as Aristotle famously put it.[13] Being taught to act and feel correctly in youth is a *necessary* but not a *sufficient* condition of eventual virtue. It is true that a just act may be defined as one that a just person would do. But if you are an adult and wish to be considered just, you will not be considered so merely on the basis of doing just actions; rather, it is only if you do them *in the way* that just people do,[14] that is, if you act justly as a direct or indirect result of your own choice. The same is true for our emotions: we can generally be held responsible for those because we can generally be held responsible for the kind of persons we are, including the kind of emotive dispositions we have allowed to grow inside us. To choose an emotion, on the Aristotelian view, is to choose to cultivate it.[15] Once the relevant disposition has taken root, it will not be necessary for practical reason to dictate every experience of the emotion – we will simply act and feel in accordance with our character.[16] But practical reason can still be called upon, if needed, to justify the experience of the emotion in each particular instance, and also to adjudicate between the competing claims of competing emotions in times of conflict.[17]

This Aristotelian point is emphatically echoed in modern cognitive theories of emotion: 'Insofar as our emotions involve beliefs, and insofar we are in some sense responsible for what we believe, we are also responsible for our emotions',[18] Solomon says, the point being that we are generally responsible for having, in the first place, come to believe what we believe. There may come a time when our emotional make-up becomes irrevocable, when long-standing dispositions can no longer be uprooted, but that does not necessarily diminish our responsibility, for as Aristotle noted, we are still accountable for having allowed those dispositions to take hold. More specifically, we have, up to that supposed point of no return, various ways of controlling, suppressing or eliciting our emotions: we can open ourselves to argument, persuasion, and evidence; we can force ourselves to be self-reflective, to make those judgements regarding the moral content and purpose of our emotions, such as our pride and jealousy or lack thereof, that defuse or activate them.[19]

Convincing as Aristotle's account of the construction and regulation of (as well as our responsibility for) emotions generally is, there is no reason to accept uncritically everything he says about moral upbringing. For instance, he may have dismissed too quickly the possibility, however faint, that a young devil may turn out to be an old saint, as well as vice versa. Admittedly, by insisting on the fact that we are as adults responsible for our vicious as well as our virtuous dispositions, Aristotle rejects not only the

claim that bad upbringing is *sufficient* to make us bad, but also that good upbringing is sufficient to make us good, for both vice and virtue require that we as mature agents, via practical reason, make a contribution to the development of our moral dispositions through carefully selected actions and reactions that are conducive to their respective ends. Nevertheless, Aristotle's account precludes the possibility that persons who have not been brought up virtuously as children will see anything attractive about virtuous dispositions once they have become adults;[20] if not immoral, they will at least turn out to be amoral. This may well be true as a rule of thumb, but surely there are exceptions, even important exceptions, where people learn to 'see the light' in later life although they have been born and bred in moral darkness.

All in all, Aristotle may have paid too little attention to the point of the claim which later became Michelangelo's famous motto: 'I still learn'. A true character change, a true change of emotional structure, for example, is not something that Aristotle really envisions as a possible moment of adult life. It is all a matter of early education:[21] 'For it is impossible, or not easy, to alter by argument what has long been absorbed by habit.'[22]

This brings us to the third point where we would do well to disagree with Aristotle: he takes an even dimmer and more unreasonable view than our most pessimistic contemporaries of the usefulness of reasoning morally with young people. If we want to effect change in the emotions or actions of the young, we must do this through habituation, not argument; hence Aristotle's famous claim that 'a youth is not a suitable student of political science; for he lacks experience of the actions in life which political science argues from and about'.[23] If this is understood simply as a warning against letting inexperienced persons take important political decisions, or ruminate over moral and political issues about which they lack basic knowledge, then there is no reason for complaint. However, Aristotle's discussion in the *Rhetoric* reveals that he is making a much stronger claim: namely, that the young are generally too immature, irascible, idealistic, uncontrolled, excessive, etc.,[24] to engage in a moral dialogue at all. Sherman claims that Aristotle's 'habituation is never a mindless process, but one that must engage the learner's critical efforts from the start'.[25] While she does not produce strong textual evidence for this claim, one might argue that even when a child picks up the proper emotional response through direct instruction or imitation, it still has to learn, step by step, to discriminate critically between future situations which are similar enough to the original one for the same response to be fitting there, and those which are not. But that does not change the fact that the young are not, according to Aristotle, to be persuaded through *moral reasoning* of the appropriateness of the given response, and thus the question remains how it is possible that they can ever be initiated into the practice of such reasoning if they are not allowed to take the first uncertain steps at an early age. Such initiation need not be tantamount to 'helping the

shoots to grow by quickly pulling them upwards', which according to an ancient Chinese fable simply leads to the plants losing their roots and withering away. Even if complicated moral quandaries may still be beyond a child's reach, we can envisage a reasonable dialogue with a six-year-old (let alone a ten-year-old) Betty about whether she should still be so jealous of her friend Kate two weeks after only Kate's poster was chosen for display by the teacher, a dialogue which rests on argumentation rather than habituation, and seems definitely to be within the child's intellectual repertoire. Such a dialogue would be concerned with the basic questions Aristotle himself posits about the moral justification of an emotion: whether it is directed towards the right person, at the right time, and in the right amount.

While there are arguably some flaws in Aristotle's account of moral upbringing, I am unsympathetic to the major objection which tends to be pressed against it. According to this objection, Aristotle is obsessed with the powers of moral and emotional coaching and ignores a person's inborn endowments – that what is bred in the bone must come out in the flesh. Are people not born touchy or placid; are there not innate temperamental types such as 'timid', 'bold', 'upbeat', and 'melancholy'?[26] This is not the place to go deeply into the perennial *nature–nurture* debate. An old Icelandic proverb tells us that 'a quarter depends on cultivation', which means, presumably, that three-quarters of a person's talents and characteristics are inborn. Indeed, current research seems to indicate that these proportions may not be far off the mark. Even if it is true, however, that one must not overlook constitutional differences of temperament and other natural endowments, the right moral conclusion to draw from that seems to be to nurture with even more effort that which can be nurtured – taming as much as possible the over-excitable, stimulating the under-excitable, and so forth – rather than shrugging one's shoulders and leaving the emotional life of the young to nature's tender mercies. For, as Alexander Bain once put it, 'the naturally strong, left to itself, will grow still stronger',[27] and this applies to our faults as well as our talents. Furthermore, even if emotional susceptibility were, to a large degree, inborn and resistant to change, what cannot be inborn are the beliefs which lay the basis for particular emotions. Nobody is *born* with the belief that it is morally wrong for a father to discriminate undeservedly between his two children – recall my jealousy cases in chapter 5. Radically different emotions may be characterised by similar 'feels' and intensity (see s. 1.2), but insofar as the individuation of emotions rests on the morally-inspired beliefs held in each particular case, there is every reason to honour Aristotle's injunction to guide the emotions of the young onto the right paths. Which side of the nature–nurture debate we come down upon has little bearing on that issue.

The recent Aristotle-inspired emphasis on the amenability of the emotions to schooling, coupled with the cognitive-theory understanding (also of course harking back to Aristotle) of emotions as made up of beliefs

and desires, does have important educational implications, as I stated at the beginning of the section. Although the general message is positive and liberating, there is, so to speak, both good news and bad news. The good news is that it is possible to effect a *qualitative* change in young people's emotions through careful nurturing, whether it be through habituating or reasoning. We might attempt the latter alternative, for instance, to rid a child of irrational guilt when it blames itself for the fact that one of its parents has been struck with cancer. Once the underlying belief has been drawn out from the child through discussion, games, or artistic expression, the right way to proceed seems to be to reason with the child and to try to make it change its mind about the facts of the matter, as a result of which the bad feeling, hopefully, disappears. In other words, cognitive theories of emotion give room to the possibility that people, even children, can, in principle, be argued out of their emotions.

The bad news, however, is that various *quantitative* regulations of emotions, suggested by received folk wisdom, as well as by alternative theories of what emotions really are, now appear to be rather useless and superficial. Letting children 'blow off steam', diverting their attention from the emotional objects, allowing a fervid emotion to 'run its course', the old 'rugby and cold showers'-methods of the boys' schools, etc., may all be well up to a point, but that point turns out to be rather low and insignificant. Once the core element of an emotion is acknowledged to be a belief, there is no reason to expect that belief to change, any more than other (non-emotion-grounding) beliefs, unless superseded by another belief. Time as such does not change beliefs, although it may make them less important for the individual or help sink them into the realm of subconscious – only new experiences and new beliefs do. If a white person acquires the belief as a child that blacks are dirty and dangerous, then that belief will continue to evoke the respective emotions of disgust and fear until a contrary belief has truly and non-self-deceptively (s. 1.3) taken over. The essential rationality of emotions is thus, as de Sousa notes in a different context, at once 'liberating and oppressive'.[28] It is liberating in the sense of yielding prospects for radical educational results, but oppressive in the sense that the methods required to attain those results turn out to be more complicated and time-consuming than one might have hoped for.

It is no doubt the liberating part of those educational implications that has propagated the current wave of interest in 'emotional intelligence'. This has suddenly become a buzzword in the fields of psychology, education, and business. *EQ* (as opposed to, or complementary to, *IQ*) guides tell us that emotional intelligence determines 'your success in relating to people and your success in any given job', and that emotional intelligence amounts to nothing less than 'the single most important factor in predicting relational and job success'.[29] This recent fashion has brought the schooling of the emotions back onto some educational agendas, where it had been viewed

suspiciously for decades, though more so in business courses, where moral character training has suddenly acquired pride of place, than, as yet at least, in ordinary teacher-training programmes.

Moral philosophers might be thought to react to this trend with approval. After all, the idea of emotional intelligence can hardly be understood as anything but an outgrowth of the reigning cognitivism and Aristotelianism in the field of the emotions. The public guru of emotional intelligence, Daniel Goleman, thus makes it clear that by championing emotional intelligence he is taking up the 'challenge' of Aristotle 'to manage our emotional life with intelligence' so that we can feel the right emotions towards the right persons, at the right time, and in the right proportion – all in order for us to function well as moral and social beings.[30] On a more practical note, the fact that many employers have started to demand *EQ*-competence from job applicants, and that educational institutions are starting to respond to this demand, might mean that in the future more philosophy graduates will have job opportunities directly related to their field of interest: organising and teaching *EQ*-courses.

Nevertheless, many moral philosophers and philosophers of education are sceptical of the *EQ*-craze, and that is not merely (although, no doubt, partly) because of a built-in antipathy to current fads and flavours of the month. The main problem lies, perhaps, in the definition, or lack thereof, of the notion of emotional intelligence. To be sure, we are told by the fathers of the concept that emotional intelligence is to be 'defined as the capacity to process emotional information accurately and efficiently, including that information relevant to the recognition, construction, and regulation of emotion in oneself and others'.[31] Also, we are told that this 'intelligence' encompasses domains such as knowledge of one's emotions, management of emotions, and the abilities to motivate oneself, recognise emotions in others, and handle relationships.[32] All this is well and good, but two things will start to worry the philosopher here, one slightly and the other seriously. The slight worry is that the theory may be a bit too ambitious for its own good, both theoretically and practically. At the theoretical level, it is not concerned exclusively with what philosophers and psychologists tend to refer to as 'emotions'; rather it incorporates all kinds of other psychological abilities and life skills. At the practical level, it does not only tell (teach?) people to regulate their emotions, but also to work on their 'self-control, zeal and persistence', amongst other things.[33] Philosophers should, admittedly, be the last to complain about a theory that encourages people to manage their life in general with intelligence, but the question remains whether the theory may not be slightly over-defined, and panacea-like, for its own good.

The second, and more serious, worry relates to the *EQ*-theorists' lack of concern with moral issues. We are told precious little about the overall criteria for being an emotionally intelligent person, only that a rise in *EQ* will enhance personal and professional success. However, if

that achievement is to be measured simply by one's own ideas of what counts as success – and the *EQ*-theorists tend to be liberal enough not to offer us any other yardstick – then we may ask in consternation what emotional intelligence will mean for the ambitious drug baron. The problem here is not so much the general one that any successful scientific method can be used for both moral and immoral purposes, but rather that not enough thought has been given to what really constitutes personal and professional success and how, precisely, a rise in *EQ* contributes to such success. The theory of emotional intelligence thus stands badly in need of a prole-gomena, such as the one that I tried to offer in chapters 1–3 of the present book, explaining what an emotion is, what emotional excellence really involves morally, and how particular emotions are to be justified. If there is a place for the concept of emotional intelligence, as I believe there may well be, then *EQ*-training should only foster those emotions which are rational and morally fitting. Otherwise, at least, it cannot purport to be taking up 'Aristotle's challenge'.

Another attempt to account for a wide range of human potential in children and adults, an approach slightly older and more influential in mainstream educational circles than 'emotional intelligence', is Howard Gardner's theory of 'multiple intelligences'. His idea, simply put, is that people can be smart in more ways than one or, more specifically, in more ways than those revealed through typical *IQ*-testing. Gardner's theory has been much-hyped of late and needs little rehearsing here. Pedantic philosophers may sneeze at his more or less arbitrary categories with their more or less fuzzy boundaries: the 'intelligences' used to be seven (linguistic = word smart; logical–mathematical = number smart; spatial = picture smart; bodily–kinesthetic = body smart; musical = music smart; interpersonal = people smart; and intrapersonal = self smart); now naturalist smart (nature smart) has been added and more categories are in the offing.[34] Nevertheless, the basic idea that there are other factors, psychological and physical, than those measured in *IQ*-tests that contribute to how well people fare educationally, or even generally speaking in life, is non-arbitrarily true, and Gardner has done well to package and sell it in the right quarters, namely, among educators.

From the point of view of our present study, one may lament the fact that the role of the emotions in the good life is somewhat under-explored in Gardner's theory. Indeed, *EQ*-theorists complain about the same lacuna there.[35] Gardner chooses, for some reason, not to include a special category of emotional intelligence, although his followers will be quick to point out that competence in the field of emotions is a necessary by-product of the two correlative categories of 'interpersonal' and 'intrapersonal' intelligence: in nutshell form, of understanding other people and of understanding oneself. Be that as it may, Gardner's theory gives us scant clues about how to measure and appraise the ways in which people experience the right or

wrong emotions in the right or wrong circumstances and has, in general, scarcely more to say about the moral dimension of operating effectively in life than does the theory of emotional intelligence. The spirit of liberal pluralism, with its overly-thin account of the human good (see s. 2.1) and its emphasis on self-chosen roads, haunts both theories, as it does most of current educational thought. It is, historically speaking, a rather distressing fact that for those genuinely interested in cultivating rationally formed and morally fitting emotions the most inspiring writings are still those of Aristotle, written 2,300 years ago.

6.2 Why all the lingering doubt?

Why has emotion education not been incorporated to a greater extent into the school curriculum – why have educationalists remained resistant or largely unresponsive to recent philosophical and psychological trends in emotion research? When trying to advocate the need for more emphasis on moral education in general, and emotion education in particular, in meetings with teachers and parents, I have often come up against a wall of objections and suspicions. Since the doubts expressed there have tended to echo misgivings and to rest on arguments familiar from the scholarly literature, I surmise that the cause of the resistance can be traced to certain intractable beliefs – I would like to call them industriously propagated *myths* – about the futility, if not the downright danger, of character training. Let me, in the following, single out for consideration some of the most common 'myths' of this kind that I myself have come across in discussions with parents and teachers, and try to dismantle them. My argumentation in this section will be negative rather than positive. The positive argument for cultivating morally commendable traits, not least emotional traits, in the young has already unfolded itself in the foregoing discussion; the main need now is to consider the objections that tend to be raised against such a project.

First objection:　Morality cannot be taught in schools because a person's moral life is largely dependent on his emotions which are non-rational and uncontrollable, and, more generally speaking, because morality itself is based on relative, even subjective, value judgements.

　　The first part of the objection takes us back to discarded precognitive theories where emotion was understood as a spanner thrown into the works of reason: a disruption of rational thought. One might be tempted to retort abruptly, like Sherman, that the notion of emotions as 'purely passive receptivities' is 'simply false'.[36] However, the persistence of this way of thinking cannot be casually dismissed as a coincidental error of knowledge; it strongly indicates that the message of the cognitive theories of the last quarter of a century or so has not as yet really filtered through society, and/or that myths from an older period still hold people self-deceptively in

grip although those same people may, at other times, pay lip-service to the essential rationality of emotions. There seems to remain something obscurely enticing about the vision of emotions as mindless pushes and subrational stirrings – of 'the heart ruling the head' – even for people who know better. Irrational views are not so easily uprooted with rational means; yet the only thing we can do here is to try to present and underline all the good arguments (most importantly, in the present context, to parents and teachers) for the fact that, as Nussbaum puts it, our emotions 'are not brutish but highly discerning, not devoid of thought but infused with thought', thought which can be significantly shaped in the young by reasoning about the good.[37]

When the relativity card is played, one is often hard put to find convincing answers, especially since it is tends to be backed up, in our part of the world, by a deeply-entrenched liberal ideal of state neutrality, according to which the state and its educational institutions must never promote some activities as intrinsically better than others. I have already argued in this book that the liberal ideal does not hold water, and that it is liable to collapse into a much more radical ('postmodern') form of relativism, making our emotions, in the end, unintelligible, to mention but one of its implications (s. 2.1). The problem with radical postmodernism is that it is *irrational* (paradoxical) in more ways than one;[38] in reasoning with teachers and parents, however, one should concentrate on the *unreasonableness* of milder and more pervasive forms of relativism. The claims that people's emotions differ essentially in different societies and that 'a quick tour through the ages' reveals that each society has its own 'bag of virtues'[39] simply rub up against the facts. Considerable and growing evidence, both anecdotal and academic, attests to the contrary conclusion – namely, to the fascinating convergence of people's emotions and moral virtues in different societies at different places: the akinness of man to man that Aristotle said we experienced in our travels.[40]

I believe that the most potent and telling evidence against moral relativism which has already come forth (and is yet to come forth) stems from research done by anthropologists and psychologists. For instance, it helps us no end in the ongoing battle against relativistic demands of school neutrality on morality and emotions to be able to cite established psychological research on how children in every society start to feel *empathy* – the natural building block of more mature *compassion* – as soon as they can recognise the existence of others. No less important are comparative studies of older children from radically different cultural backgrounds sharing a universal moral sense based on common human desires and aversions.[41] Whether in rural India or urban US, children share a repugnance towards theft, vandalism, and harming innocent victims. Needless to say, they will disagree over various less basic values – for instance, whether it is 'decent' or not to eat beef or address your father by first name. Such differ-

ences of decency and etiquette between social groups need to be respected in schools in the spirit of pluralism, but that pluralism will be much weaker than the liberal multiculturalism of our times, let alone the postmodern 'politics of difference'. For once we accept that underneath those superficial differences lies the common human nature – the fundamental moral virtues and vices which cannot be ignored in any functional society – we realise that dispositions to act and react in morally appropriate ways should, ideally, be cultivated in every child in every home and school in the world, and that school neutrality on issues of character formation is worthy of blame rather than praise. As the eminent child psychologist William Damon correctly notes, the challenge for today's pluralistic societies and their educational establishments is to locate precisely the 'common ground' from which to 'communicate the shared standards that the young need'.[42]

Second objection: Morality cannot be taught in schools because there are no experts on moral behaviour and moral emotions.

Underlying this objection are, I think, two distinct but related kinds of fear: first, what we could call 'missionary fear', fear that moral education in schools will lead to children being inculcated with some or another sectarian doctrine; and, second, fear of the whiff of paternalism, fear that children will be deprived of the possibility of thinking critically about moral issues themselves and reaching their own solutions, as these will be handed over to them ready-made. In general, what are the grounds – an objector will hasten to ask – for a claim to competence as an expert on emotions and morality, the claim that a teacher must make if his words are to carry authority? Here, various considerations are pertinent.

First, an expert need not be omnipotent and infallible. Meteorologists are experts on weather although they often get their predictions wrong. There is no good reason to doubt that, in general, a teacher who has taken courses in moral philosophy will be better qualified to help students think about moral issues than one who has not. Moreover, there seems to be a pretty uncontroversial sense of 'emotional expertise' in which persons can have expert knowledge about particular emotions and their moral justification, and also about the degree and manner by which emotions can be regulated,[43] although invariably they are not able to get their own emotions right. It would do no harm if all the physics teachers in our schools were potential Nobel laureates in physics; we are happy to settle for less, however, because we know that a well-qualified physics teacher, even if not a world figure, can tell our children at school what they need at that point to know about the subject. Teachers in moral education need not, in a similar vein, be paragons of morality themselves – full-blown *megalopsychoi* – yet, they can enlighten pupils' minds and convey considerable knowledge as long as they are qualified, both personally and professionally, for the job.

Second, as many writers have correctly noted, there is no way in which children can avoid 'catching' morally-imbued attitudes, beliefs, and habits from their teachers. Just as there exist no alternative dispositions to those of compassion, truthfulness, honesty, etc. into which we might reasonably be said to be initiating children in the name of proper moral education, wherever they are in the world, there exists no alternative to teaching children about virtues and vices at school. That happens covertly whether or not we like it to be done overtly. For instance, teachers are already teaching emotions in all sorts of ways, through their attitudes and reactions. Is it not better that we free ourselves of the bogey of indoctrination and accept that such education be conducted in an open, reflective manner? Is it not even a serious dereliction of duty on the part of all those engaged in child-rearing to fail to see to it that education of emotions and other moral attitudes – those indispensable ingredients in a life worth living – is carried out in a controlled and systematic way?[44]

Third, no serious writer on moral education of late has, to the best of my knowledge, suggested that such education should consist in teachers ramming moral truths, missionary style, down pupils' throats. That method would be counter-productive, not only *pedagogically*, as force-feeding generally teaches pupils little else than the shape of the spoon, but also *morally*. Children need to learn themselves to understand moral concepts and to distinguish good from bad moral arguments. To reach that goal we need to introduce them gradually, via diverse methods (s. 6.3), to the art of moral reasoning: to a reflective and self-reflective dialogue on moral issues. As Aristotle would be the first to remind us, morality is not like mathematics, and surely the worst way to teach morality at school would be to give pupils a textbook of puzzles beforehand with all the right answers at the back.

Fourth, many teachers tell us that the decisive factor in the objection concerning lack of moral expertise lies in the fact that this is what parents believe: 'Parents do not want us to educate the emotions and moral attitudes of their children; they think this should be their own job.' However, is that really true? It may have been so decades ago, in the alleged halcyon days of female 'home-makers' and sagacious grandparents at hand (whether such days ever existed, for the majority of people, is another story); nowadays, at least, national surveys in the Western world reveal that the vast majority of parents favour some sort of moral education in schools.[45] An interesting survey that a colleague at my university, a lecturer in early-education studies,[46] recently conducted among the parents of kindergarten children showed that of the ten most highly-ranked objectives of the kindergarten, the top four were moral objectives: teaching considerateness, rule-following, problem-solving through dialogue, and listening to others. Only in fifth place came outside activities (the emphasis on which is often thought to be *the* role of the kindergarten in my country!); learning to count and to recog-

nise the letters of the alphabet did not even make it into the list. There is no particular reason to think that parental requests for increased moral education in schools mean that the parents want to absolve themselves of responsibility. Asking for a helping hand from the schools is not the same as renouncing the generally accepted view that parents are *primarily* responsible for the moral upbringing of their children. Obviously, parents should be kept well informed about the content of moral education classes; but then, the same applies to all the other school subjects.

Third objection: Morality cannot be taught in schools because children lack motivation to act morally.

The idea behind this objection is that children can be motivated to learn the ordinary school subjects because of the benefits that they yield, either immediately (like reading) or later (algebra might seem boring now, but you need it to do well in college). However, similar reasons do not work with children in the case of morality, for being a moral person does not necessarily make you more successful in life in the sense that children understand ('rich and famous'), and even if morality confers, in the end, worth and meaning upon a human life, such considerations will be too abstract for children to grasp. A number of substantive points about values in life and appreciation of such values are at stake here, but let me concentrate on the more practical issue of motivation.

This objection seems to go seriously amiss as to what triggers children's actions and reactions, what makes them tick. It overlooks, for one thing, the earlier-cited facts about children's empathy. Most children like being kind and helpful to others and doing the right things. 'Doing the right things' implies knowing *when* to do them – for instance, knowing when a certain emotion is appropriate and when it is not. The intrinsic enjoyment of gaining competence in a task, such as that of the 'moral game', can even be undermined in children through the presentation of external rewards, for then the satisfaction of having mastered the virtue conducive to the internal goods of the game in question has been overshadowed by externalities.[47] If the moral development of the child follows the right path, the child will by puberty have started to use moral terms to define itself: as 'generous', 'honest', 'proud', etc.[48] The original disposition to empathy will then have resulted in salient effects on the child's own self-image in general and self-respect in particular: its reasons for being and acting at all. However, there are many potential obstacles on the path to moral maturity, and we should never forget Mill's message about how the capacity for 'nobler feelings is in most creatures a very tender plant, easily killed, not only by hostile influences, but by mere want of sustenance'.[49]

Should empathy not be operative in a child at a particular time or in a particular instance, the child might still act and react in commendable ways: for children are prudent creatures who know, just as well as grown-ups, that

the person whose back you scratch now is likely to scratch your back later. If all else fails, a child may, like an adult, be moved by fear of punishment. Needless to say, moral educators should aim at fostering, or rather aim at helping children foster, moral motivations beyond tit-for-tat. However, that is not the point here. The point is rather, in response to the objection under discussion, that empathy, prudence, and the deterrent effect of punishment are all strong motivators, and there is no reason to suppose that they cannot, one by one or combined together, trigger a child's interest in learning about how to feel and behave morally. Besides, children tend to be actively interested in interacting and communicating in various ways with their peers, especially through games and the sharing of toys, objects, and experiences; and since moral education is precisely concerned with rewarding human interactions in the widest sense, it looks like something for which children might normally have a predilection rather than a disinclination. That also seems to be the general verdict of those who have taught such a subject (under whatever name) at school.

Fourth objection: Morality cannot be taught in schools, except through habituation or simple modes of persuasion, as children are not intellectually capable of taking in advanced moral arguments.

The pervasiveness of this objection during the last quarter of a century has little to do with Aristotle's dim view of young children as philosophers. Rather, it stems from Lawrence Kohlberg's extensive research of people's moral development from childhood to adulthood: research whose results – or should I say whose interpretations in standard textbooks in education and psychology[50] – held the world of academic educational discourse more or less captive for two decades. Taking his cue from Jean Piaget (another educational psychologist whose ideas are typically simplified, reified, and given a life of their own in textbooks), Kohlberg conducted numerous cross-cultural studies of moral development by dint of hypothetical dilemmas in story form, the most famous being the one about Heinz who broke into a drugstore to obtain life-saving medication for his dying wife, medication that he could not, for reasons of poverty, get his hands on by other means. Should he have stolen the drugs or should he not? On the basis of the respondents' answers to such dilemmas, or more precisely on the basis of the *justification* they gave for their answers, Kohlberg famously identified three qualitatively distinguishable, hierarchical levels of moral development (each one incorporating two stages) through which every person in every society passes in succession, albeit at different rates and with different final stops; some people never even progress past level I:

Level I: Preconventional Morality (motivation through self-interest)
Stage 1: Punishment/obedience ('Won't do it because I'll get punished')
Stage 2: Pleasure/egoism ('Won't do it because it deprives me of pleasure')

Level II: Conventional Morality (motivation through social approval)
Stage 3: Interpersonal relations/conformity ('Won't do it because I want to fit in')
Stage 4: Social order/laws ('Won't do it because it breaks the law')

Level III: Principled or Postconventional Morality (motivation through reflected, abstract ideals)
Stage 5: Social contract/utility ('Won't do it because it is not my obligation')
Stage 6: Universal rights/principles ('Won't do it because it is not truly right')

While there are considerable individual differences in moral maturity at the same age level, the most important of Kohlberg's findings, for our present purposes, is that stages 1–2 are dominant prior to and during the primary-school years. Stages 3–4 hardly emerge until early adolescence; after that, however, they become the most common form of moral reasoning for teenagers – and, notably, for adults, too. Only approximately one-tenth of all adults ever reach stage 5, let alone (except for people such as Gandhi and Mother Teresa) stage 6 of self-chosen, self-reflective, rationally universalis-able, and convention-independent moral principles. These are not the most optimistic, or even 'hopist',[51] of results, and no wonder that they have not boosted much confidence in those concerned with the moral education of the young.

Fortunately, these are not results with which we need to be stuck. In recent years, the Kohlbergian approach to moral development, which has influenced at least two generations of kindergarten, primary school, and high school teachers, has come under a fire of criticism. All of a sudden, Kohlberg's findings are no longer the last word on moral maturity and how to measure it, not even in textbooks. First, his methodology has been given a sound drubbing: why should we consider moral maturity tantamount to the resolution of complicated moral dilemmas? Did not the range of dilemmas chosen also happen to be singularly unfitting to children's concerns and interests? What about emphatic responses in the young, their moral imagina-tion and understanding of moral concepts: are these not better indicators of moral maturity than readiness and aptitude to adjudicate dramatic conflicts?[52] Second, why are Kohlberg's examples all concerned with the development of moral reasoning about *justice* and *fairness*, at the expense of concerns about the existence or non-existence in his respondents of such familiar moral virtues and qualities as self-control, courage, compassion, temperance, and honesty?[53] Third, why judge moral maturity merely on the grounds of reasoning abilities rather than whether, for instance, actual moral behaviour ensues or does not ensue from such reasoning?

Fourth, and most important perhaps, is Kohlberg's lack of engagement with emotions as elements of moral maturity, even though those are

elements that appear at a very early age in children and heavily influence the way in which they react and behave. The fundamental problem here is that Kohlberg's philosophical approach is skewed from the outset towards a deontological Kantian 'view from nowhere', a view from which any grounding of morality in personal desires or social settings is written off from the outset as blatantly 'heteronomous' and wrong-headed (recall s. 4.1). What matters morally are only 'autonomous' decisions reached through pure reason.[54] Such a view, largely out of favour with contemporary moral philosophers, resists or (to say the least) does not accommodate well the moral relevance of emotions, as well as being completely at odds with the social nature of morality. This kind of criticism, about the lack of concern with emotions, was unfortunately run together for some time with the much more specific and controversial feminist misgivings about Kohlberg's approach ignoring the 'female element' of care in a moral life,[55] misgivings which implicitly endorsed the somewhat outdated conception of women as more emotional than men.[56] What should be highlighted here is, rather, the role that Kohlberg and his followers failed to give to emotions in the moral lives of *both* men and women.

Now that we have turned – or at least are turning – away from the Kohlbergian approach, the fourth objection above against cultivating morals and emotions at school has lost most of its sting. After years of neglect, however, we have to make up lost ground. We must first try to deactivate two common concomitants, in school settings, of the discarded approach. The first is the deeply entrenched under-estimation of children's moral capacities. Educationalists need to acknowledge in theory – theory that can issue in actual curriculum change – what they have probably already accepted in practice: namely, that non-egocentric actions and reactions are not only possible, but rather the norm, in children much earlier than Kohlberg's approach allows for. Even at the kindergarten level, children are capable of profound compassion (providing, unprompted, a crying peer with a security-object as a source of comfort), advanced discussions of fairness (of how to divide up candy bars in this way or another), and, generally speaking, of carefully distinguishing between *conventional* and *moral* reasons for doing things.[57]

Secondly, we must rid ourselves of the self-fulfilling prophecy effect of Kohlberg's findings. By saying that, I do not mean that Kohlberg himself ever deterministically cast doubt on the possibility of stimulating and precipitating children's progress through the moral stages. On the contrary, rather than sustaining the status quo, he encouraged parents and teachers to motivate development from the child's current stage to the next through various methods, including cross-stage classroom discussions of moral dilemmas where children would learn from more advanced pupils how to reason better. In that sense, the bleak, pessimistic message of the fourth objection cannot really be ascribed to Kohlberg himself. Nevertheless, the

underlying assumptions that the progress through the posited stages is sequentially invariant – that no stage can in essence be omitted – and that moral development is to be assessed exclusively via response to complicated dilemmas, give Kohlberg's approach the aura of a self-fulfilling prophecy: you know pretty much in advance what you are going to find and, to be sure, you find it.

Radical paradigm changes in education should always be taken with a grain of salt. After all, teachers have, from earliest times, been educating people who share a common human nature. Theories may come and go but the human denominator remains more or less the same. Rather than making a clean sweep of an historically important approach such as Kohlberg's, we should try to utilise its insights. Notwithstanding all its shortcomings, Kohlberg's research has bequeathed to us a wealth of information about at least *one* salient facet of moral development. Moreover, his contribution can be seen as one more crucial step in a direction that has characterised educational thinking going back to the time of Rousseau and even further: the readiness to appreciate childhood and adolescence as distinct developmental phases, rather than treating the young as small adults. Perhaps, however, the time has now come to reverse this otherwise positive trend somewhat, for if the insights of the cognitive theories of emotion are correct, children's emotions will have the same basic structure (beliefs and desires) as those of adults. Jealousy in a child is the *same* emotion, with the same *ingredients*, as jealousy in an adult, although it may not share the same *evoking* object or situation. In general, children's emotions are rational or irrational, morally fitting or unfitting, according to essentially the same moral criteria as those of adults, and although the methods to regulate children's emotions (s. 6.3) will necessarily be different from those we would use with adults, the eventual goal of emotion education is the same for everyone irrespective of age: to cultivate dispositions to feel the right things in the right contexts.

6.3 Didactics

How precisely can we aid the young in the construction and regulation of their emotions? Philosophers, even those highly interested in the morality of emotions, are generally loath to descend to such particularities and practicalities. Some feign ignorance of techniques and teaching methods; others positively take pride in not producing a formal programme of study. For instance, David Carr, in his otherwise enlightening book about moral development and education, chooses to 'remain obstinately unrepentant' about not engaging in any discussion of moral didactics, characterising such discussion as 'largely vacuous' or 'downright fatuous'.

Carr is probably right in saying that most of the 'major mistakes about the moral educational role of the teacher'[58] can be traced to misconceptions about the nature of moral knowledge and moral development – witness the

four standard objections that I tried to rebut in the foregoing section – rather than to faults in curriculum theory or pedagogical techniques. Nevertheless, it would be a matter for grave concern if *all* moral philosophers were as eager as Carr to evade responsibility for the implementation of their ideas about moral and emotional excellence in educational contexts, by shunning entirely the *form* of such education while claiming (with good reason) to have a lot to say about its *content*. A stringent form–content dichotomy would, at any rate, be completely at odds here with the Aristotelian hands-on approach to moral education, an approach on which Carr for one draws considerably when exploring the nature of a moral life. Being myself employed as a professor of philosophy in a department of education, aiming to educate professional teachers rather than professional philosophers, I would – unlike Carr – feel repentant if I did not make some effort to clarify and examine, if not prescribe, the pedagogical options available to teachers concerned with the moral and emotional upbringing of their pupils. After all, it is, as Aristotle says, actual practice that improves the states of people's souls rather than merely taking 'refuge in arguments, thinking that they are doing philosophy'.[59]

While academic discourse on moral education tends to be primarily school-oriented, I cannot resist the temptation to preface my discussion of moral didactics with a brief reminder about the role of the home. Everyone knows that parents are patterns, and one risks being platitudinous in trying to explain that truth any further. Nevertheless, the common relegation of the family context for moral and emotional development to academic sidelines might indicate that the positive role of parents in fostering such development is at least under-researched, if not under-appreciated. For instance, Lawrence Walker points out that relatively little research has been carried out on the early socialisation of emotions.[60] Yet, as far as I know, no eminent psychologist or philosopher has ever seriously questioned Aristotle's view that parents' early interaction with their children is crucial for character formation, in particular for the development of normal emotional reactions, the basis for which may be laid in intimate moments of parent–child attunement at the infant stage.[61] More research has been done on the effects of negative and positive parenting on the self-image and moral behaviour of older children and teenagers, research which predominantly seems to take its cue from Diana Baumrind's helpful distinction between four parenting styles: authoritative, authoritarian, permissive, and rejective-neglecting.[62] Her findings, which have been confirmed in various contexts and various places, including my own country,[63] strongly suggest that an *authoritative* parenting style, which combines consistent, clearly explained rules, and strict limits with loving acceptance, is more conducive to self-understanding, self-discipline, and social responsibilities (for example, avoidance of smoking, drinking, and drug abuse) than other styles. Indeed, one can conclude that (overly) authoritarian, permissive, or neglectful

parenting is a likely, if not a certain, recipe for emotional imbalance and moral/social maladjustment.[64]

Even though Aristotle was sceptical of the prospects of other forms of moral teaching than habituation for the young, he emphasised that such habituation should take place not only in the home but should also come within the province of communal education and 'legislative science'. He thus deemed it vitally important that 'the community attends to upbringing, and attends correctly'.[65] While one may infer from his writings that the school ought to enlist the help of parents to cater for individual needs (since they know their children better than the teacher),[66] there is no doubt that any consistent Aristotelian would acknowledge the school's crucial role in moral education. Moreover, contemporary Aristotelianism, refurbished along the lines suggested in section 6.1 – being more sanguine of subsequent moral influence to correct rather than merely polish the effects of early habituation – will accept that even when a child's home environment has in some ways been hostile and debasing, the school may act as an important 'value preserve',[67] advocating moral ideals and stabilising unbalanced emotions. It is to the school, then, and its role in cultivating proper emotions that we must now turn.

Any overview of 'tools and techniques' of emotional regulation must start with the simplest one: *behaviour control*. However unsympathetic we may be to the Aristotelian fixation on habituation, there is no denying the fact that a pupil rewarded in class for properly prideful behaviour is not only likely to *display* such behaviour again, but also truly to *experience* proper pride in similar contexts. One need not be an out-and-out behaviourist to appreciate the power of the stimulus–response mechanism. Nor is there necessarily anything unsophisticated about keeping children away from objects which can evoke harmful emotions; not letting children go to night clubs or watch sex and violence on the movie screen is, as Ben-Ze'ev correctly notes, a simple but effective (or so we think) form of emotion regulation.[68] Further, old-fashioned instruction and drill do no doubt work, up to a point, in instilling moral attitudes. What I said earlier about force-feeding not teaching us much else than the shape of the spoon may be correct, but sometimes the shape of the spoon itself is a useful thing to know. However, even when relying on mere orders and exhortations, or formal codes of conduct, it is vital that the teacher, as well as the parent, supplement the do's and don'ts from the very beginning with the how's and why's, and prompt children to learn to look at things from another's point of view. For though the children may still be too young to grasp the significance of the explanations, they will at least learn that arguments matter: that any injunction to feel this or that emotion or to exhibit this or that behaviour is mindless and void unless backed up by a moral rationale.

Another powerful tool of behaviour control is 'bootstrapping'. Being forced to act out an emotion, that is, to engage in actions associated with the

relevant emotion, can in the end lead to its internalisation.[69] (It is no accident that the male opera lead so often truly falls in love with the female lead!) Similarly, we can, to a certain extent, defuse an emotion by inhibiting the behavioural responses that typically accompany it. The truth that earnest pretence may, in some cases, be the royal road to sincere beliefs could perhaps be exploited in the classroom through role games where moral emotions are displayed and learnt, as well as in community-service projects where the pupils get into the habit of being compassionate through repeated compassionate actions.

The effects of direct behaviour control notwithstanding, the old truth remains that one teaches best who lives best oneself. The teacher cannot avoid being a *role model* to the class, be it a positive or a negative one: amongst other things, the pupils model their emotional responses on the teacher's in many ways: adopting the same patterns of believing, desiring, and doing. A prideful teacher stimulates prideful pupils, etc. – a fact curiously overlooked by Kohlberg through his concentration on autonomous adherence to moral rules. This fact of moral and emotional modelling was precisely the point of the claim in the foregoing section about there being no alternative to emotion education in the classroom. Damon suggests that the school should bring more positive role models (moral achievers from public life) into the classroom for pupils to observe, identify with, and emulate.[70] Such stratagems, as well as careful attention to the general ethos of the school itself as an institution, are laudable; yet nothing can replace the direct precedent set by the teacher. Not to put too fine a point on it, a good teacher must be a good person, a person who can, in David Carr's words, demonstrate 'to children through his own conduct what decent and principled attitudes and behaviour towards others are like and how they enrich a human life'.[71]

I would strongly recommend here, as mandatory reading for all prospective teachers, Nietzches's essay on 'Schopenhauer as Educator'.[72] There, Nietzsche – drawing on an example from his own life – argues how a teacher can and must be a *moral exemplar*, presenting excellences to which the students can attain. Such exemplification does not consist in the instillation of a desire to imitate, to be exactly like the exemplar, but rather in the capacity to be inspired by example and to see it just like that, namely, as an *example* of how a fulfilling life can be lived and what it involves, morally and emotionally. The important prerequisite here is that of first gaining the pupils' trust and, subsequently, being worthy of that trust. Instead of a simple copycat effect, the trust in the moral exemplar can, then, enhance the pupils' self-understanding and critical honing of their own characters.

Self-understanding is a key word in this context. On a cognitive view of emotions, the most powerful techniques to regulate emotions will be those which prompt students to examine critically their emotion-beliefs and to reorient them if necessary. As we saw already in chapter 1, the problem with

many unjustifiable emotions is not primarily that they are morally unfitting (although they are probably that as well), but rather that they are irrationally formed. For instance, self-deception undoubtedly plays a big part is such common emotions as disgust of other races, fear of ghosts and spiders, and so forth. The most profound and enduring effects on the emotions, particularly in young people whose belief-systems are still more flexible than those of their elders, are effects that change the heart by changing belief. In order to change one's beliefs, however, one must know what those beliefs are. So what is needed at the outset is precisely self-understanding in the most transparent and untechnical sense of the term.[73] Although Freud's 'talking cure' contained much theoretical baggage that I am unwilling to accept, it at least highlighted this simple truth about the necessity of self-knowledge, knowledge which can often only be attained by understanding others and taking their perspective of oneself. Sometimes, after we have realised what we really believe, belief-change is not even required; rather, a mere reordering of beliefs and a change of perspective is enough. For instance, flight attendants reportedly learn to defuse their anger towards obnoxious passengers not by changing their beliefs about the obnoxiousness of the behaviour, but rather by focusing on another distinct belief, namely, that this is probably a person suffering deep down from serious fear of flying.[74] To take another example, according to Roberts, we do not need to cease judging a situation dangerous to cease experiencing fear. Often, we only need to refocus it: perhaps as a 'rescue task' instead of a 'threat to my well-being'.[75] As in the case of Wittgenstein's famous duck–rabbit figure (see s. 1.2), we first see only one aspect, being blind to the other, but then we may learn to shift our focus. 'The bully who did such-and-such to me' might, after such a reordering of beliefs, be seen as 'the boy in my class who is neglected by his parents', thus defusing my anger.

In the course of our exploration of emotion regulation at school the basic question, then, is: which technique best serves the cognitive-theory ideal of reorienting emotions (by dint of actual belief-change or the refocusing of beliefs) through the critical work of reason? Carr maintains that no fundamental moral virtues can be learnt in any context of socialisation or education apart from the example of parents, teachers, and peers.[76] While I agree with the importance of the *moral exemplar*, described above, for this purpose, I think that another method may be at least equally effective: a method that can be summed up in two words, *stories* and *discussions*. These two normally go together; before talking about the discussion of stories in the classroom, however, let me say something about the stories themselves.

Stories of various kinds – myths, legends, fairy tales, tragedies – have always served as a powerful tool of self-definition, self-clarification, and socialisation, especially for young people. Such stories acquaint the young with the ways in which human beings react, well or badly, to life's vicissitudes, and, more generally speaking, with what it means to be human.[77]

However educationally untrendy, there is surely nothing wrong with giving a child a book to read that we think will reinforce morally fitting emotions and kind deeds; nor is there anything blameworthy about the time-honoured technique of reading a story to young children and driving home its 'moral'.[78] Any experienced children's librarian will be able to suggest various books and stories that can serve this purpose.[79] So even in default of time and opportunity to do anything more with the stories (for instance, owing to the infamous 'lack of space in the curriculum'), simply reading them or having them read can have positive moral value.

However, ideally, we should do something more with the stories. Various research findings show that peer discussion, led by an enthusiastic and experienced teacher, can heighten pupils' awareness of moral issues.[80] Their moral vision becomes enlarged by the generation of alternative possibilities as they listen to and reflect on a story and exchange views on how and why the characters felt and acted in this way or that. How *should* they have felt? How *should* they have acted? Through grappling with questions of that kind, in the relaxed atmosphere of a 'sharing circle'[81] or a 'community of inquiry' (see below), children's conclusions and choices, tempered by critical evaluation of those of their peers, will hopefully strengthen their self-respect, and effect, step by step, a genuine foundation for moral and emotional excellence.[82] The teacher plays a key role here: the teacher has to find space for group discussions of this kind within the already-packed curriculum, choose the appropriate stories, and guide the discussions along the right path. People such as Matthew Lipman and Gareth Matthews have made the teacher's job here all the easier: Lipman with his specially constructed philosophical novels for children, and Matthews with his suggestions of how already-existing children's literature can be used as a source for philosophical inquiry in the classroom.

The mentioning of Lipman and Matthews is very much to the point, for the philosophy-for-children (*P4C*) movement, which they represent, has probably developed one of the most advanced techniques of classroom discussion abroad in the field. Lipman suggests that the classroom be converted into a *community of inquiry* in which pupils learn to 'listen to one another with respect, build on one another's ideas, challenge one another to supply reasons for otherwise unsupported opinions, assist each other in drawing inferences from what has been said, and seek to identify one another's assumptions'.[83] What is more, Lipman and his followers have devised various tools and tips for practical implementation: on how to establish and run such a community.

It is no coincidence that the best thought-out blueprint for the teaching of emotional virtue in the classroom that I have yet seen comes from Lipman.[84] In his article on how to use philosophy to educate emotions, Lipman first highlights the typical cognitive-theory insights on how we can learn to distinguish reasonable from unreasonable modes of feeling, much as we can

learn to distinguish reasonable from unreasonable forms of inference. Since children are reasonable creatures – sometimes even more reasonable than their elders – they can also learn to value appropriately what has value, in the realm of the emotions, providing they are given a chance to do so: the right method, the right time, and the right setting. Within the friendly but intellectually challenging atmosphere of a community of inquiry, children will thus gradually be able to realise that 'Harry has no good reason to be ashamed for providing an incorrect answer to the teacher's question' or that 'Harry's resentment of Lisa is inappropriate', to give two examples from stories that Lipman discusses:

> Our little, surreptitious community of inquiry […] whispers together about the appropriateness or inappropriateness of what happened and of the emotions manifested, and we struggle shakily towards a verdict. It is a verdict we do not forget, when it comes to be our turn to select the emotion that will alter the face we turn towards the world.[85]

Having made myself somewhat familiar with the *P4C*-movement – amongst other things by attending one of its biannual world conferences – I believe there is a lot to admire in the way it attacks the time-honoured problem of a philosophical teaching method for the young. I take the *P4C*-methodology to be particularly useful in handling – clarifying and critically reordering – moral and emotional attitudes, as well as revealing common logical truths and blunders. However, a motley group of people, representing various distinct philosophical assumptions and agendas, has gathered together under the rubric of *P4C*. That very diversity, on the one hand, together with a certain tendency within the movement to view itself as an isolated philosophical sect, on the other, gives reason for serious concern. *P4C* can never be the only word or even the last word on moral education; as we have already seen in this section, there are various other ways, apart from the strict procedure of a community of inquiry, to stimulate moral and emotional growth. Of dubious value also is the claim of some *P4C*-enthusiasts that the community of inquiry is *the* teaching method for *all* subjects at school. Peer discussion in the classroom does not get off the ground unless the pupils have some preconceptions – prejudices, if you will – on which to work.[86] In the case of emotions and moral attitudes, there is fortunately no shortage of those. However, I am at a loss to understand what could be the starting points of discussion for pupils at the beginning of their first algebra class, to take one example.

Most disconcerting, however, is the idea emanating from some *P4C*-writings (I exclude Lipman and Matthews here) that a conclusion, moral or otherwise, arrived at in a community of inquiry is true simply in virtue of having been arrived at in a certain formally correct way. The Platonic

Euthypro-type of question crops up once again: is the conclusion not arrived at in such a community because it is (hopefully) true, rather than being true because it is arrived at there? I must admit, on a personal note, that sometimes when listening to *P4C*-enthusiasts I am reminded of an old Chinese fable about a man from the state of Chu who wanted to sell a precious pearl in the state of Zheng. He made a casket for the pearl out of the wood of a magnolia tree, which he scented with fragrant osmanthus and spices. He then ornamented the casket with pearls and jade. A man from the state of Zheng bought the casket, but gave him back the pearl. The upshot was that the man from Chu certainly knew how to sell a casket but was no good at selling pearls. However enamoured we are of the methods of *P4C*, we must never forget that what we want our pupils to buy in the end is the pearl, not the casket. *P4C* must thus be kept uncontaminated by moral formalism, and by liberalist (not to mention postmodernist) relativism about *the good*, which is the pearl inside the casket, if it is to retain its credibility as a handy teaching method. In spite of these caveats, I believe that teachers interested in helping pupils enhance their morally inspired emotional intelligence have a lot to learn from the *P4C*-movement in general, and from Lipman in particular.

I have yet to mention one subject which I think can help pupils considerably in understanding and mastering their own emotional geography, namely, *art*. Unfortunately, in modern times we have seen art being sidelined in the school curriculum: relegated from its ancient role as a fundamental school subject to that of being a happy diversion from, or an embellishment on, the things which really matter at school. How far removed that is, for instance, from Aristotle's notion of the role of music which he thought could shape character and moral attitudes, with melodies conveying imitations and reflections of moral behaviour and emotions. More specifically, Aristotle believed that music could habituate pupils to 'true pleasures', by balancing their emotions and purifying those of the extremes of excess and deficiency.[87] I could also have chosen Plato as an example here, as he tendered similar arguments about the edificatory role of music; so did, in fact, most educational theorists in ancient to medieval times.

Artistic activities at school, such as music, painting, creative writing, imaginative play, and drama, can I think make at least a threefold contribution to emotional cultivation: they help pupils express and come to grips with emotions which are too painful or hidden to surface in open discussion (for example grief over parental loss); they enable them to put themselves into other people's shoes (assuming, in imagination, the others' feelings); and they have a general balancing and organising effect on pupils' emotional life. My ideal school would emphasise the *five R's* (reading, writing, arithmetic, right, and wrong) and it would do so, to a considerable extent, not only through Socratic (*P4C*) dialogues, but also through the wholesome workings of art.

To bring this section about didactics to a close, I would like to mention a particular school where many of the techniques mentioned above have been put into practice, reportedly with considerable success. This happens to be the world's largest school: the City Montessori School (*CMS*), a non-profit, non-sectarian establishment for children from kindergarten age to grade twelve, in Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh, India, with almost 20,000 pupils and fifteen local branches. Notably, the four theoretical 'building blocks' of the school are all of a moral nature: *Universal values* (belief in the capacity of all children to learn moral virtues, daily reflections on universal virtues, use of moral ideals and exemplars, value education of parents, teacher training in value-based education, etc.); *Excellence* (moral and emotional excellence as the foundation of academic excellence); *Global Understanding* (exchange programmes, early exposure to different cultures and religions with emphasis on common elements, promotion of activities for building world peace); and *Service* (extensive community service projects in collaboration with parents and teachers). The *CMS* has aroused attention both nationally and internationally for the outstanding academic results of its pupils (outscoring all other Indian schools on national exams, pupils winning an unmatched number of state-wide merit scholarships, etc.) – which seems to indicate that the ideology 'morally good makes academically good' really works.[88]

Being disillusioned, as many are, with repeated 'eureka'-cries from educationalists, I found myself sceptical of all the wonder stories coming from Lucknow. However, after having had a chance to converse with Mrs Bharti Gandhi, who together with her husband founded the *CMS* forty years ago with only five students, and to listen to reports by colleagues who have visited the school, I believe that its reputation may well be more than yet another nine days' wonder. Of even more significance than the school's emphasis on moral education as such is the assumption that mere knowledge of moral ideals and principles is not enough: that children must learn to translate ideals into practice. The *CMS*'s moral education programme thus goes beyond critical analysis and intellectual appreciation, by trying to connect knowledge of the good to volition and desire and, generally speaking, to the children's character formation.[89] Good moral deeds flow from a good moral character, and such character requires – perhaps more than anything else – balanced and cultivated emotions.

As far as tools and techniques are concerned, the *CMS* does not provide any new, original solutions: It simply makes eclectic use – good use, or so it seems – of the methods already sketched: behaviour control, bootstrapping, moral exemplars, reflections, discussions, and art. Evidently, the main pedagogical lessons to learn from this Indian school are, first, that it is best to utilise the combined resources of various methods rather than relying on one-track moral didactics;[90] second, that all these laudable methods only work (or, at least, work best) if value education has already been incorporated

into the teacher-training programme[91] and teachers and parents work together on modelling the values and supporting the child; and third, that to cultivate virtues in children, teachers need to integrate moral education into the larger fabric of learning. The correct way to teach emotional virtue is thus not to create yet one more new class, but rather to blend lessons on emotions with the subjects already being taught.[92] Emotions are, after all, an integral part of human pursuits, and to study life is, in many ways, to study people's emotions, including one's own.

There may well be a grain of truth in John Deigh's bleak message about some emotions being 'ineducable', being essentially unresponsive to reason, as one's susceptibility to them in certain contexts is fixed and cannot change.[93] However, the younger the child is, the less likely it is that its emotional reactions are stubbornly fixed (s. 6.1). At any rate, we should, with the help of the didactic repertoire that I have outlined, try our best in our schools to work on the educable part of children's emotional terrain; for without rationally formed and morally fitting emotions they can never – whatever their academic credentials are – lead good human lives.

6.4 Teaching the virtues of pride and jealousy

The main responsibility of an emotion educator, be it a parent or a teacher, is to help students acquire the emotional dispositions needed in the human world. To prepare them for a life among gods or beasts would be a disservice not only to the society they are entering but also, and even more so, highly unfair to the students themselves. Making them overly undemanding, unjudgemental, and meek means that they will be left to the tender mercies of other less saintly persons; making them overbearing, obtuse, and callous means that other people will be at their mercy. It is difficult to say which is the lesser of the two evils.[94]

A well-constructed curriculum in emotion education will seek to foster those emotional traits which bring to experience and expression morally justifiable emotions at the right times and towards the right persons. One might think that the return to contemporary currency of Aristotelian ideas about the morality of emotions has made people realise that not all the emotions commonly described as 'negative', let alone all the negatively-evaluating emotions (see s. 1.4), should be considered morally negative – and that learning to experience some of these in the right circumstances could actually be a moral achievement. Yet, in most cases, such emotions continue to be tarred with the same old brush, and not to be given any positive peda-gogical consideration. I hope that my discussion in the foregoing chapters has prompted a new look at least at the two 'negative' emotions of pride and jealousy, and I shall now try to bring out some of the educational implica-tions of such a reconsideration.

First of all, it stands to reason that the less need we have for negatively-

evaluating emotions, the better. Jealousy is such an emotion par excellence; pridefulness straddles the distinction between negatively- and positively-evaluating emotions: It is negatively evaluating in so far as we value our own doings negatively, being moved towards shame, and in so far as we view ourselves as disregarded by others; it is positively evaluating in so far as we incline towards simple pride over our attainments, and contentment with external recognition. A considerable part of emotion education regarding these two emotions must be to encourage such traits in persons as will lessen the need for jealousy and for the negatively-evaluating part of pridefulness. The young must be taught not to discriminate undeservedly, or without good reason, between rivals, hence precluding as much as possible the appearance of rationally formed and morally fitting jealousy in others. They must also be taught to recognise openly others' achievements, so that the latter's pride(fulness) is not hurt. Last, but not least, the young must learn to construct their own ambitious but reasonable standards of self-respect and to abide by those standards, thus taking pre-emptive measures against shame.

However, there will always be cases, in an imperfect world, where expectations of and demands for deserved treatment are violated. It is no coincidence that among the emotions which make the earliest appearance in children are those of pride, shame, and indignation. Nature 'knows' where the shoe most commonly pinches. It does a child (*A*) no good to be taught, in cases where it is unjustly disfavoured by *C* vis-à-vis *B*, or where *A*'s achievements go undeservedly unrecognised, to react with dumb, demure mortification, or simply to assume the Stoic shrug: the rugged settling for what there is, however less than perfect.[95] The child should not be encouraged to find solace in soothing palliatives – to assuage, appease, and mollify its awakening aversion to and beliefs about unjust treatment – but rather to construct out of those positive emotional virtues of pride and jealousy, in their correct proportions.

David Tombs has convincingly outlined the way in which the deeply ingrained pridefulness of students with South Asian backgrounds can be seen as an educational asset in British schools, to be encouraged and guided into the right paths rather than ridiculed or resented.[96] Similarly, children's sensitivity to jealousy in undeserved comparison–failure situations (recall the art teacher's choice of posters in s. 5.3), as documented for instance by Bers and Rodin,[97] should be viewed positively as a motive for socio-moral development and adaptation: an impetus towards personal achievement and a sense of desert.[98] Even Ben-Ze'ev, while sticking disappointingly to his assessment of jealousy as an 'overall negative' emotion, accepts such cases as indicating that jealousy should not be completely eliminated.[99] A neighbour of mine, a Polish music teacher, once told me that the traits he spent the most time instilling in his young daughter (with the aid, *inter alia*, of emboldening music!) were those of proper pride and jealousy: to learn how

to say boo to a goose when needed, and not to kiss the rod. Indeed, it might be argued that one of the most significant contributions to the full emancipation of women would consist in making them in their upbringing at least no less prone to *megalopsychia* than men.[100]

No doubt, the greatest challenge when embarking on a course of 'assertive training' in pridefulness and jealousy is to avoid the extremes of the two virtues: for pridefulness, vanity and arrogance; for jealousy, too much sensitivity to undeserved treatment, leading to invidious and implacable envy. There is every reason to believe that the traditional negative moral evaluation of pridefulness and jealousy is due to the dangers of excess, rather than to the nature of the emotions themselves when kept within their proper limits.[101] However, such dangers are arguably less acute in the young than the old, for in spite of the former's general tendencies to excess, they are, as Aristotle notes, more guileless and less cynical than the old who have often been deceived and humbled by life.[102] Thus, young people's noble simplicity, as opposed to the disenchanted cynicism of their elders, makes it all the easier to help them steer clear of those emotional extremes which are primarily caused by the tendency to interpret everything in the worst light. To take but one example, a pupil will normally be ready to accept, without bitterness or suspicion, a reasonable explanation from the teacher to the effect that non-discriminative behaviour by the teacher in the classroom (the alleged opposite of which is a common cause of pupil jealousy) does not entail identical treatment, but rather equal effort to satisfy the needs of each pupil.[103]

Wit, an Aristotelian moral virtue and one which tends be in high supply in young people, protects them against the tendency to take themselves too seriously, one more common source of excessive pridefulness and jealousy. For similar reasons, de Sousa recommends the cultivation of 'emotional polysemy' (a sense of irony) as a way to enhance emotional flexibility and moderation.[104] Being too worried, however, about the prospective excesses of pridefulness and jealousy must not lead us too far into the opposite direction, namely, to the cultivation of their defects. When that has happened, I always suggest first, as a general corrective, a possible change of reference group: being able to evaluate oneself favourably against others who are worse off, and to give them a helping hand, is not only a well-known remedy for low self-esteem,[105] it can also work wonders for the helper's self-respect. As Robin Dillon cleverly puts it, 'taking on the responsibility to help others climb out of the depths may result in one's having climbed out with them'.[106] More specifically, dealing with people in straitened circumstances or coping with some of life's other tragedies, can strengthen our own sense of justice and fair treatment, and make us more ready to stand up for moral ideals. Empathising with others whose potentials and attainments go unnoticed makes us, for example, more keenly aware of our demand that our own achievements be recognised, and that we ourselves are not discriminated against.

In line with the message from section 6.3 about the need for specific emotion-fostering didactics in the classroom, some more detailed suggestions are in order. Needless to say, the teacher's own precedent is here as always vital, the value of a proper display of pridefulness and jealousy in relations with fellow-teachers and pupils is enormous.[107] But there are other more specific strategies at hand. To raise pridefulness at the primary school level, the didactics of art and a community of inquiry can, for example, be combined by a teacher in the following way: ask the pupils what they think of when you mention the words 'moral achievement'. Record their ideas on the blackboard and, if necessary, add some of your own. Explain that you want the pupils to illustrate a moral achievement, using watercolours. Ask them to think of such an achievement that made them proud, and suggest that they either paint themselves achieving their goal or paint a 'token' of the achievement, such as someone's gratitude or happiness. Circulate around the room as the pupils begin to paint, and offer encouragement to those who are reticent to think of personal moral accomplishments. After the paintings are ready, ask each child to write below the illustration 'I am proud that I …' and name the accomplishment. Invite the pupils to share their pictures with the class.

After all that is done, form a community of inquiry in the classroom and pose questions such as the following: How difficult was it to think of a moral achievement to illustrate? Why is it important to be aware of your accomplishments? How does it feel when you reach your goal and when you do not? How does it feel when people do not appreciate your good and hard work? How should you react (in different circumstances) when your efforts are not recognised?[108] The main purpose of this exercise is to build awareness of the child's own moral achievements and the way in which such achievements *do*, on the one hand, and *should ideally*, on the other hand, make the child and others feel and react.

Another exercise, to stimulate justified jealousy, based on Bers and Rodin's poster example, would be to lead discussion in a community of inquiry about Betsy's proper emotional reaction. Her poster was at least equally as beautiful as Kate's; yet the teacher only chose Kate's poster to hang in the hall. What might have been the teacher's motive? Could it have been a good one (like making up to Kate the fact that last week there was no space for her contribution)? If not, why did the teacher treat Betsy this way (options: thoughtlessness, deliberate wish to offend and discriminate, or something else?). How did Betsy probably feel inside? Should she have felt that way? Is it good not to care when you are disfavoured vis-à-vis your peer for no good reason by a third party – and what counts here as a 'good reason'? What kind of emotional reaction is too strong and what kind is too weak? To illustrate the answers to the last question, the pupils could be prompted to paint the faces of jealous people. In countries whose languages connect envy, including jealousy, to the colour green, the children would be

asked to paint faces of people who are too jealous (dark green), not jealous enough (a fading shade of green), and then moderately jealous (properly green). Music could also be brought into the discussion and exercise, as children are normally quick to connect emotions to music, as well as colours. What kind of music symbolises jealousy? When is the jealousy too 'loud' or not 'loud enough'? – And so forth. Indeed, the didactic possibilities are endless for an innovative teacher, given children's acute interest in emotional and interpersonal issues.

No doubt, my suggestion about the important functional role of proper jealousy and pridefulness in children, and how such emotional dispositions should be cultivated, will not be to everyone's taste. Most likely initial suspicion will centre on whether we are not undermining children's innocence by instilling in them such hard-boiled and hard-headed, if perhaps pragmatically useful, traits. The obvious response there is that *innocence* is at best a pre-moral or an amoral state, not morally commendable as such. The innocent are not only unaware of their own goodness, they are unaware of their potential badness as well. Moral maturity – the state into which we gradually want to guide the young – involves self-understanding, reflective moral judgements, and an intimate acquaintance with sources of common temptations, vulnerabilities, and errors. Lack of such maturity, however charming in infants and toddlers, is a substantial moral lack.[109] Moral progress does not involve ossification at the stage of innocence, let alone a return to it once we have left it. Parents and teachers do children no good by prompting them to remain, Peter Pan-like, in a state of uninformed pre-morality. Keeping them ignorant of the practicalities of the world that they must enter, and suppressing the dispositions that they need to survive in it – to function and thrive as human beings – is a Greek gift.

Incidentally, the common fascination with childlike innocence is more than a simple moral error, or an easily explained psychological tendency in parents to cling to their children's dependency and naivety; it has much deeper roots. Behind this fascination lurks a more general, and historically entrenched, *moral primitivism*: nostalgia for a 'lost world' where man qua species (primitive man, 'children of nature') and qua individual (as an unspoiled child) is still undefiled and unfettered by the heavy chains of culture and civilisation. Underlying such *primitivism* is what I like to call, to borrow a phrase used by Richard Rorty in a different context, a moral 'myth of the given': the belief that what is given in man's soul is the morally good, and that because of the primacy – logical, psychological, and historical – of the good, the past, both at the individual and at the societal level, is somehow morally superior to the present. 'From childhood memories, and from a few others, there emanates a sentiment of being unintegrated, and then later of *having gone astray*, which I hold to be the most fertile that exists', are famous words from André Breton, the erstwhile high priest of surrealism.[110]

Moral primitivism forms the core of numerous religious and secular philosophical doctrines, the most famous one in educational circles being perhaps Rousseau's description of the ideal secluded upbringing of a morally perfect child of nature in *Émile*,[111] and in political theory, Marx's historical materialism. For Marx – to summarise a well-known primitivist example – the original form of society (the *Urgesellschaft*) was a morally perfect state, without class distinctions or oppression, where all people worked according to their abilities and received according to their needs. There was nothing *morally* or *psychologically* defective with people's condition in this 'primitive Communist' society; the only reason why it had to disintegrate and develop further was a *technical* one: People did not at this time have the scientific or economic means within their grasp to sustain themselves on a secure basis. Humanity then fell from this state of innocence through the formation of a series of exploitative societies (slavery, feudalism, capitalism), one superseding another according to dialectical principles, each one being at a higher technical, but at a lower moral, level than its predecessor. Meanwhile, people's real nature has been obfuscated and fettered by 'false consciousness'; finally, however, in a future Communist society, human beings return to their lost state of innocence and recover their pure essence. There, they are completely 'free' psychologically (as they were in the *Urgesellschaft*), the only difference being that the new kind of Communism is at a satisfactorily advanced technical level to feed all its members and provide them with adequate leisure time. Other primitivist theories tend to follow a similar *fall from innocence–alienation–redemption* pattern as Marxism, and to aim at the moral and psychological liberation of people's nature through a restoration of 'the age of innocence'.

However 'spiritually' tempting this seems, the main problem with moral primitivism is that it lacks substance both historically and psychologically. As more down-to-earth thinkers since the time of Aristotle have been aware, mankind started from a low and primitive level, the first stage of which was surely no moral paradise, and the history of civilisation is not one of degeneration and decline but of gradual, if variable, improvement.[112] Moreover, although children seem normally to come into the world endowed with a capacity for empathy (s. 6.1), they are not born with any moral *beliefs*: the 'innocence' of infants and toddlers is, as noted above, a pre-moral condition rather than an indication of inherent moral purity, and they are easily provoked to acts which, from a moral perspective, will be seen as cruel. According to an Icelandic proverb, 'no one wants to remember his childhood'. The commonness of the moral idealisation of the primitive, immature, and unreflective attests to the veracity of that proverb.

Citing the artist Breton above was rather to the point, for in mainstream Western art we can discern a strong tendency to reject or suppress realistic visions of childhood – not, however, as in many pre-Enlightenment educational theories, by equating children with adults, but rather, by exalting

childhood to a special domain above and beyond the realm of the human. In art, children typically play the role of emissaries between the human world and the ideal world of light and beauty: the incorrupt, the perfect. Incidentally, a completely reverse tendency is also visible, especially in twentieth-century art, where children are depicted as symbols of the dark and untamed: the primordial evil. Thus, children in traditional Western art tend to appear not as real young humans of flesh and blood, as beings in this world with this-worldly desires and emotions, but rather as symbols either of paradise lost ('small angels') or of dark, eerie forces and uncontrolled subconscious drives ('little devils'). Both symbolisations perpetuate moral 'myths of the given', and blind us to the fact that children are, in fact, neither purely good nor purely evil, but simply human beings on the thorny road to maturity.

Another objection that will undoubtedly be raised against my project of teaching pride and jealousy as emotional virtues is that the project is essentially *elitist*, only open to a small self-assertive elite, blessed in advance through favourable social and psychological conditions, and hence leading to discrimination between children. This is a claim that I strongly deny. Recall first earlier arguments about how *megalopsychia* is a potential option for everyone given a minimal standard of living (such as most of us *do* already enjoy in the Western world, and all of us *should* enjoy) and minimal 'moral luck', not only for a select class of superior people. Everyone can be morally ambitious, aim at high moral standards, and be pridefully concerned about the attainment and recognition of those standards.[113] Various external conditions can, of course, prevent a child from being exposed to the education it needs to build up a moral character, but every child who is taught to act and feel correctly in youth can have in itself the makings of a *megalopsychos*. Chapter 4 also showed us that the realistic self-assessment of a person who has in fact achieved more morally than others has nothing to do with elitist immodesty, but rather exemplifies a wholesome kind of modesty. So far is it from being true that the *megalopsychoi*'s concern with external recognition and deserved treatment means that they think of themselves as *essentially* better than others, that the reverse seems to be the case: the appreciation of similar vulnerabilities as those with which other human beings have to live – the countless unforeseen and inevitable events that can cut the ground from under one's feet – are the very foundation of the *megalopsychoi's* sense of equity, as well as their deep compassion towards their neighbours and their willingness to lend them a helping hand.[114] It is, then, precisely the pridefulness of the *megalopsychos* which kindles rather than extinguishes sparks of compassion – it is through learning to demand proper respect from others that the *megalopsychos* realises that what matters is, more generally, that people are not prevented by their neighbours from reaping as they have sown. It is bad enough to be the victim of ineluctable bad 'fate', as can happen to any of us; it is even

worse to be deprived of your just rewards through lack of human concern. Hence the *megalopsychos* becomes, as it were, prideful on others' behalf: wanting them also to get their merited recognition, and experiencing compassion on their behalf if they do not.

Incidentally, strong arguments *against* an elitist view of moral and emotional excellence can be elicited from the writings of a philosopher often dismissed as elitist: Nietzsche. To become a Nietzschean 'overman', a person must overcome himself by consecrating his emotions and giving style to his character, a challenge which Nietzsche sees as potentially feasible for everyone although he thinks that most people will sadly never meet it, being too lazy and complacent. But that is, so to speak, their own decision. The role of the moral exemplar, underlined by Nietzsche (s. 6.3), is precisely to awaken us to our own possibilities of perfection. By contrast, hero worship, putting others on a pedestal as those who can do what you yourself are not cut out for, is in Nietzsche's view simply an evasive strategy: a cheap excuse for not trying to compete with them. In matters of emotional excellence, teachers should thus, if we give heed to the Nietzschean challenge, aim at making moral heroes out of everyone.[115]

However, before turning Nietzsche's call into practical account in the classroom, we must reconsider the background, role, and responsibilities of the teacher. Previous sections of this chapter have brought home to us that a good teacher must be the pupils' keeper: must act as a moral exemplar, shepherd as best possible the pupils' moral and emotional development, and make reflective use of the didactics of emotion education. Initiation into the practice of teaching should mean that teachers have acquired the appropriate set of virtues and skills to be capable moral educators. Nevertheless, the sad fact is that most teacher-training programmes fail to prepare teachers for work on moral, emotional, and interpersonal issues; as a consequence of this teachers frequently express insecurity about how to address such issues in the classroom.[116] Carr even talks about a 'conspiracy of silence' among teacher educators on this topic.[117] That silence is not surprising in light of the fact that most of the discussion of *professionalism* in teaching, so fashionable of late, has run its course without any attention being given to teaching as a *moral* profession. The Swiss scholar Fritz Oser constitutes a welcome exception here with his insistence that long-run 'effectiveness' in teaching always has a moral dimension, and that the 'ethos' of the teaching profession involves, first and foremost, the capacity to stimulate moral discourse.[118] Teacher trainees need to work on their own discursive skills in philosophical dialogues with their own peers before they can reproduce and conduct moral discourse in the classroom.[119] Prospective teachers must be taught to make themselves intelligent judges of character, and to realise that if they do not exercise their judgement on the developing character of their pupils, the pupils will be the sole judges of each other. Most important of all, they must be prompted to forget what they may have learnt

earlier about being morally neutral, endlessly tolerant, and non-judgmental.[120] Instead, a teacher should ideally develop a keen sense of moral appropriateness in order to be able to distinguish between morally fitting and unfitting actions and emotions and convey this sense to the pupils through the methods outlined in the foregoing section.

Unfortunately, without the appreciation and implementation of these truths in teacher-training programmes, any suggestions to the effect that teachers should help students promote morally valuable emotions – especially as subtle and sensitive as those of pride and jealousy – will continue to fall on deaf ears and be of little avail.

7

CONCLUDING REMARKS

This book has tried to weave together various strands, originating in diverse disciplines, perspectives, and traditions, about human emotions. The most general aim was to secure an understanding of the very idea of *morally justifying* emotions. To do so, I argued, we needed a foray into the field of general moral theory: to look for the theory which not only gave the most satisfactory account of the justification of our actions and dispositions to *act* – which tends to be the sole requirement made of moral theories – but also of our emotions and dispositions to *react*. After disposing of liberalist deontology and contemporary virtue ethics, which for different reasons failed to satisfy this latter requirement, classical utilitarianism stood out as a viable candidate. Utilitarianism is frequently charged, among other things, with giving rise to a problem of victimisation; what we found, rather, is that utilitarianism itself has been victimised by its opponents. When satisfactorily formulated, along classical Millian lines, what emerges is a virtue-based moral theory which explains why and how the cultivation of certain emotional trends promotes the general happiness of the individual in question and of all mankind, and also gives us clear advice about how to adjudicate particular morally relevant emotional conflicts.

It came to light, however, that we not only needed a general moral theory to help us justify emotions but also that, in order to understand the moral role of individual emotions, dispositional and episodic, it was necessary to put them into the context of a character ideal: the ideal of a person of moral and emotional excellence. How would a person such as Aristotle's *megalopsychos*, a person who has learnt or is in the process of learning to live without vice, react in the given circumstances? The recourse to such a character ideal has, as emerged in the course of our discussion, both theoretical and practical (edificatory) value; without the idea of an integrated life of excellence, a well-rounded, well-constructed symphony of reactions, we are hard put – even theoretically – to grasp the role of particular tones and pitches and how they contribute to the whole. Educationally, such an ideal is invaluable in teaching us, and helping us teach others, how to live well. Nevertheless, the response 'emotion *x* is morally justified in this context

because a *megalopsychos* reacted like this' can always be called into question[1] and referred to the highest authority – namely, our general moral theory – for arbitration.

In section 1.1, I complained about the lack of such a moral theory in Ben-Ze'ev's otherwise impressive and extensive overview of individual emotions which includes an analysis of the *morality* of those emotions. However, at various places in Ben-Ze'ev's book, there is reference to the 'adaptive value' or the 'survival value' of an emotion, and this is obviously invoked as a moral considerations although he never presents it as the basic criterion of moral appropriateness. Ben-Ze'ev says about adaptive value that it is to be found in the way emotional patterns have historically evolved:

> The burden of explaining emotions should shift from reasoning to developmental processes. Evaluative emotional patterns have emerged and have been modified throughout the evolution of the species and personal development of the individual agent. Explaining emotional phenomena cannot be limited to the fractions of seconds in which we are supposed to make the various intellectual calculations, but has to account for many evolutionary and personal factors. We need not undergo the whole process of evolutionary and personal development each time we have an emotional encounter. This process has modified, or tuned, our emotional system in such a way that our surroundings immediately become emotionally significant.[2]

Ben-Ze'ev claims, no doubt correctly, that a major function of the perceptual system is to bestow upon the physical world cognitive meanings which are useful for survival. Among the basic evolutionary functions of the emotions will, in this view, be an initial indication of the 'proper manner in which to respond', and a means of social communication: the announcing to others of our 'evaluative stand'.[3] Thus, the 'purposes' of the emotions must be related to our ability to function in circumstances which evoke, or fail to evoke, particular emotions – an observation which has tended historically to dwindle into the view (although I am not saying that it does so in Ben-Ze'ev's book) that the most important, or even the sole, moral criterion of the purposefulness of an emotion lies in its *functional value*.

The present book has been short on evolutionary considerations, and perhaps needlessly so. Such considerations can be revealing and salient in various morally relevant ways, and especially so from a naturalist standpoint such as the one that I have adopted. Indeed, it is not unfitting to ascribe to the moral naturalist Aristotle a certain 'functionalist model of emotion'[4] – after all, he considered proper moral reactions an inseparable part of man's good functioning qua individual and species – and utilitarian naturalists are no less preoccupied than Aristotle with the *function* of morality, namely, its

conduciveness to the general happiness. No theories of the function of morality or moral beings can be entirely cut off from truths about the evolution of the human species and its adaptation to the world in which we live.

The fundamental problem with a pure evolutionary approach to the moral justification of emotions is, as with moral genealogy in general, its proneness to collapse into the *historical fallacy*; however, explanation of the historical (here, evolutionary) origin of *x* can never be tantamount to a moral justification of *x*. Another related problem is that, from a utilitarian perspective, the fact that a certain disposition to act or react has survival value for mankind is not – neither in principle nor, arguably, in practice – the same as its promoting the ultimate moral goal of general happiness qua deep and fecund pleasures. In our exploration of jealousy (s. 5.4) we saw that a state of affairs where goods/favours are deservedly distributed can be morally superior to a state where more abundant goods/favours of the same kind are distributed in less deserving ways, although the latter state would probably have more survival value for man qua species as judged from an evolutionary perspective. Similarly, a disposition to *Schadenfreude*, pleasure over undeserved misfortune, could, for all we know, have important functional value in allowing mankind to thrive and evolve in biologically optimal ways; perhaps a certain (immoral or amoral) roughness of mind is required for optimal adaptation. None of the preceding discussion of emotions in this book, however, indicates that such an emotional disposition is conducive to people's overall happiness.

One more problem with the evolutionary approach lies in its (covert or overt) reintroduction of the notion of emotions as blind, subrational stirrings, beyond our control. Consider, for example, as a contrast to my moral defence, David Buss's recent semi-popular defence of jealousy as an 'exquisitely tailored adaptive mechanism'. Jealousy, according to Buss, is one of the passions that we have inherited from our ancestors which 'drive us, often blindly, through a lifelong journey in the struggle for survival'. Women, he says, are programmed by their genes to cheat on their husbands at the time when they are most likely to conceive while having sex with the husbands when they are least likely to conceive, in an evolutionary struggle to acquire the best male genes possible. To counteract this tendency, jealousy supposedly evolved as a coping device, to strengthen the socially valuable bond between partners: to enable women to 'keep their men'. It may seem a gross injustice that women strive to ensure devotion from less than genetically optimal husbands while acquiring better genes from other men, but as Buss dryly points out, without a touch of sarcasm, 'women's sexual psychology is designed neither for fairness for [sic] nor justice'. Anticipating the complaint that such evolutionary determinism may be misused for improper justificatory purposes, Buss claims that knowledge of adaptive mechanisms can, by contrast, help people remain faithful: when they feel the itch to stray, they realise that it is just their 'evolved desire for sexual variety'

that is at work, not real love for another person, so they decide to stay faithful to their beloved spouses! Unfortunately, this feeble response contradicts his earlier observation that people are typically not conscious of the 'evolutionary logic' of such 'reproductive quandaries'. The emotions in question, such as jealousy, are relegated in Buss's book to the role of blind desires on a par with 'our hunger for sweets', with all moral concerns disregarded.[5] All in all, I conclude that an evolutionary account of the emotions can never replace a moral account, although it may have some relevance for a moral account.

Apart from the general objective of accounting for the moral justification of emotions, this book has also aimed at a more particular exploration and justification of two distinct emotions: pride and jealousy. Bearing in mind that the first step to regulating emotions is to identify and label them correctly,[6] I proposed a methodology for specifying emotions and applied it to the two emotions in question. To recapitulate, the sense of pride that I set out to defend, namely, *pridefulness*, turned out to indicate acute sensitivity to internal and external recognition of one's accomplishment; *jealousy*, on the other hand, involved beliefs and concerns about another person's[7] having received favours from a third party which I would, at least equally, have deserved. As opposed to the common 'negative' evaluation and moral rejection of those two emotions, I argued that not experiencing them, when called for, would be evidence of a moral failing. My defence of the emotions took not only a purely *moral* but also a *psychological* approach, with the emphasis of the first on the way in which pridefulness directly (and jealousy indirectly as a condition of pridefulness) acts as a guardian of *self-respect*, the core of one's moral commitments, and with the emphasis of the second on explaining the part played by pridefulness and jealousy in the formation and maintenance of *personhood*, so that a human being lacking the capacity for experiencing them will, in a certain sense, be less of a person. The character ideal underlying my defence was an assertive one, irreconcilable with demands for demure unconcern and submissive humility, and my discussion produced numerous arguments in favour of the assertive ideal being beneficial for both individual and general happiness. The reasonable moral injunction that one should avoid making oneself a hammer does not mean that one should, instead, assume the role of an anvil.

For people of a practical bent, however, all these moral considerations will have little value unless our emotions are amenable to cultivation – that is, unless the two old sayings have it right that 'education polishes good nature and correcteth bad ones', and the 'child is the father of the man'. Being myself task-and-achievement oriented, I took care to turn my conceptual conclusions to practical account: a job made all the easier by the recent fall from grace of less optimistic approaches to moral character training. If it is really possible to effect moral improvement on the emotions of the young, what better spur is there to philosophical inquiry? And certainly we

have considerable ground to make up in this area, after decades of neglect. More sceptical voices, however, which I rather summarily dismissed in chapter 6 as those of undue moral pessimism, do have a point in saying that a resurgence of the ideal of character education must not simply amount to an indoctrination of 'traditional values'. The fact that a disposition for some particular action or emotion is generally commended in a given culture, or even transculturally, is not sufficient reason for instilling it uncritically in the young. We need moral and psychological *arguments* about why the given disposition is conducive to happiness, arguments of the kind that I have tried to give, on a limited scale, for the two emotions in questions.

In section 1.4. I specified a 'negative' emotion as one that tends to be morally frowned upon, that is, an emotion which is, in general, *negatively evaluated*, as opposed to emotions that are, rather, *negatively evaluating*. There is no denying the fact that both the specific emotions which I have targeted in this book for re-evaluation have traditionally been considered 'negative'. I hope that my exploration has not only done away with the common disdain for pride and jealousy but, also, that it will help spark greater conceptual and empirical concern about the 'negative' emotions in general.

My defence of these two 'negative' emotions was not based on their *instrumental value* ('no pain, no gain'), nor their *contrast value* ('without those, you wouldn't learn to appreciate positive emotions'), as some other, more guarded, recent defences of 'negative' emotions have done (see s. 1.4), but rather on their not being negative at all. In the world in which we live there are numerous occasions where we can and must virtuously experience pride and jealousy as means between their respective emotional extremes in order to lead a good, fulfilling human life. This does not mean that all emotions are morally justified at some time or another. For instance, *Schadenfreude* and invidious envy are excesses of other emotional reactions which can themselves be virtuously experienced, when the occasion calls for it; but since *Schadenfreude* and invidious envy do not admit of any further excess themselves, they should always be modified towards their respective golden means. In other words, although most emotions may be morally required in some situations, common or rare, during the course of one's life, there still remain emotions which are truly negative.[8]

Why are potentially virtuous emotions such as pride and jealousy so commonly maligned and written off as (ideally) dispensable? Various reasons have revealed themselves during the course of our discussion, but let me end with a more general one. Pridefulness and jealousy will only constitute moral requirements in a world of less than morally perfect beings. If we were not ourselves liable to err and if others were not liable to turn a blind eye to our accomplishments, there would be no need for pridefulness; if people were not tempted to discriminate undeservedly between rivals, jealousy would not (rationally) ensue. As the poet Stephan G. Stephansson

realised so well, one of the strongest tendencies of the human mind is to 'dream darkness away': to pretend that we are not human beings but rather petrified angels who need to be liberated, to be set free. Such an idealised view of humanity, however, did not commend itself to the earthbound farmer-cum-poet:

> And what is gained by dreaming black is white?
> Deterring deeds to kindle light in darkness.
> It's well to know that black is never bright
> That awakes in me a longing for more brightness.[9]

It is precisely through such a realistic vision of human existence that, for Stephansson, the humanistic ideals of moral and social improvement become 'nearer and dearer' and 'the gnarled shadows darker, but clearer'. We do not need to 'shed the cloak of our humanity' to become better persons; what we must do instead is to accept the limitations of our external conditions and the fallibility of human character, and then, each of us, as best we can, must choose the 'gem chips' that glitter in our souls as guiding lights.

On the thorny road to moral progress, pride and jealousy, like most of the other emotions commonly termed 'negative', will be required; and they will continue to be required as long as we remain human beings. Stephansson prefers 'darkness' to any narrow rays of light, 'as long as the darkness is spacious'. And while 'rills' are fine, as they are 'clear and safe for wading', he enjoys the river more because of its superior 'tonal shading': not only can it murmur but also thunder. We live in a world where we sometimes need to shout rather than whisper, where the torrents of spring must have enough force to bring down dilapidated dikes. It is good for my enemy to know that I *can* 'hit harder', although I try not to use more force than necessary. If we refuse to accept this truth, we commit, in Stephansson's view, the cardinal moral error of taking ourselves to be something other than we really are: of trying to shed the cloak of our human personhood.

To change metaphors to the musical terms that I have invoked once or twice before, what we should be aiming at in our worldly existence is not a life without emotions, as some philosophers have dreamt of, nor even a life without those emotions most typically disparaged, such as anger, pride, and jealousy, but rather a harmonious whole where the different emotions add their diverse tones, at the right times and in the right proportions, to life's ongoing symphony. That is the fundamental message of my book.

NOTES

1 Mapping out the field

1 G. Taylor , *Pride, Shame, and Guilt*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1985.
2 D. M. Farrell, 'Jealousy', *The Philosophical Review*, 1980, vol. 89; 'Of Jealousy and Envy', in G. Graham and H. Lafollette (eds) *Person to Person*, Philadelphia, Temple University Press, 1989; 'Jealousy and Desire', in R. E. Lamb (ed.) *Love Analyzed*, Boulder, Westview Press, 1997; J. Neu, 'Pride and Identity', in R. C. Solomon (ed.) *Wicked Pleasures: Meditations on the Seven 'Deadly' Sins*, New York, Rowman & Littlefield Publ., 1999.
3 J. Casey, *Pagan Virtue: An Essay in Ethics*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1990.
4 To mention one example of the lack of give and take, chs 3–5 in M. Power and T. Dalgleish's cognitive account of emotions (*Cognition and Emotion: From Order to Disorder*, Hove, East Sussex, Psychology Press, 1997) canvass broadly the same historical development of cognitive theories and more or less the same set of problems as I do in the following ss 1.2–1.3, but as they do so from a psychological, rather than a philosophical, perspective, almost none of the 'leading names' mentioned are the same.
5 Aristotle, *Parts of Animals* (*De Partibus Animalium*), trans. W. Ogle, in J. A. Smith and W. D. Ross (eds) *The Works of Aristotle*, V, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1912, 645a.
6 A. Ben-Ze'ev claims as much; *The Subtlety of Emotions*, Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press, 2000, p. xiii.
7 On my intellectual indebtedness to Stephansson, see preface. In subsequent references to his poetry, I make use of existing translations by Kristjana Gunnars (*Stephan G. Stephansson: Selected Prose and Poetry*, Red Deer, Red Deer College Press, 1988) and others: see S. G. Stephansson, *Selected Translations from Andvökur*, Edmonton, The Stephan G. Stephansson Homestead Restoration Committee, 1982.
8 D. Carr, *Educating the Virtues: An Essay on the Philosophical Psychology of Moral Development and Education*, London/New York, Routledge, 1991, p. 10.
9 See K. Kristjánsson, 'Liberating Moral Traditions: Saga Morality and Aristotle's *Megalopsychia*', *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice*, 1998, vol. 1.
10 See Casey's criteria of personhood, *Pagan Virtue*, p. 2.
11 Ben-Ze'ev, *The Subtlety of Emotions*.
12 See, for example, J. Oakley, *Morality and the Emotions*, London/New York, Routledge, 1992, p. 186.
13 M. C. Nussbaum, 'The Gifford Lectures', given at the University of Edinburgh, 1993 (unpublished), forthcoming under the title *Upheavals of Thought: A Theory of the Emotions*, 2001 (unpublished draft), preface.

14 F. Nietzsche, *Human, All Too Human*, II, trans. R. J. Hollingdale, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1986, § 137.

15 J. S. Mill, *Utilitarianism, Liberty, Representative Government*, London, J. M. Dent & Sons, 1931, *On Liberty*, ch. 2.

16 R. C. Solomon, *The Passions*, Garden City, NY, Anchor/Doubleday, 1976, p. 133.

17 Some psychologists even think of a mood as a series of minor emotions, rather than as something distinguishable from emotion.

18 See Nussbaum, 'The Gifford Lectures'/*Upheavals of Thought*, ch. 1.

19 For slightly fuller but still rather simplified surveys of sensory and behaviour theories and their defects, see W. P. Alston, 'Emotion and Feeling', in P. Edwards (ed.) *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy,* II, London/New York, Macmillan, 1967, and C. Calhoun and R. C. Solomon, 'Introduction', in C. Calhoun and R. C. Solomon (eds) *What Is an Emotion? Classic Readings in Philosophical Psychology*, New York/Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1984.

20 D. Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1978, parts 2–3.

21 W. James, *Principles of Psychology*, II, New York, Dover Publications, 1950.

22 C. G. Lange and W. James, *The Emotions*, New York/London, Hafner Publ. Co., 1967.

23 Ibid., pp. 13 and 15 (italics omitted).

24 Although more has been written about Wittgenstein's 'private language argument' than most other topics in the history of philosophy, it is still a matter of great controversy both as to what the argument implies and how plausible it is.

25 S. Schachter and J. Singer, 'Cognitive, Social, and Physiological Determinants of Emotional State', in R. A. King (ed.) *Readings for an Introduction to Psychology*, New York, McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1966.

26 Actually, this point is derived from Hume's general scepticism about causal connections which he considered contingent rather than 'necessary'.

27 It is, incidentally, somewhat moot why these doctors do not reason the other way round: 'Since infants do not have the mental capacity to explain their pains away as insignificant and ephemeral, their pain-experiences are more serious than those of adults.'

28 The Jamesian kind of sensory theory has admittedly been undergoing a sort of a revival of late in psychological circles. However, even there it tends to be supplemented by cognitive insights. Although emotion is understood primarily as a physiological state, cognitive factors are invoked to account for the variety of emotions and to distinguish between them. What we end with, then, is 'a concept of emotion which is a combined awareness of both a physiological change and an associated appraisal'; see Power and Dalgleish, *Cognition and Emotion*, p. 56.

29 It is, however, not always clear against whom precisely this critical ammunition is directed (see my warning earlier in this section). Not even the radical behaviourism of behaviour analysts such as B. F. Skinner is as dismissive of inner states as the following criticism implies. G. Ryle's uncompromising *philosophical* behaviourism perhaps comes closest to representing the view of the behaviourist 'straw man' under attack here; *The Concept of Mind,* New York, Barnes & Noble, 1949.

30 Cited in G. Rey, 'Functionalism and the Emotions', in A. O. Rorty (ed.) *Explaining Emotions*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1980, p. 187.

31 See R. C. Solomon, 'Emotions and Choice', in C. Calhoun and R. C. Solomon (eds) *What Is an Emotion? Classic Readings in Philosophical Psychology*, New York/Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1984, p. 307.

32 Ibid., p. 312.

33 More sophisticated versions of Solomon's view appear in Solomon, *The Passions*, and in an appendix to his 'Emotions and Choice', in A. O. Rorty (ed.) *Explaining Emotions*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1980. The original version of that paper, which appears in *What Is an Emotion?* (1984), dates back to 1973.

34 Ben-Ze'ev, *The Subtlety of Emotions*, p. 16.

35 See, for example, Farrell, 'Jealousy', pp. 538ff.

36 C. Calhoun, 'Cognitive Emotions?', in C. Calhoun and R. C. Solomon (eds) *What Is an Emotion? Classic Readings in Philosophical Psychology*, New York/Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1984.

37 Ibid., p. 331.

38 R. C. Roberts, 'What an Emotion Is: A Sketch', *Philosophical Review*, 1988, vol. 97. See also his 'Emotions as Judgments', *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 1999, vol. 59.

39 Ben-Ze'ev, *The Subtlety of Emotions*, p. 183.

40 A. Baier, 'What Emotions Are About', in J. E. Tomberlin (ed.) *Philosophical Perspectives*, IV, *Action Theory and Philosophy of Mind*, Atascadero, CA, Ridgeview Publ. Co., 1990.

41 R. de Sousa, *The Rationality of Emotion*, Cambridge, Mass./London, MIT Press, 1987, p. 182; 'Emotions, Education and Time', *Metaphilosophy*, 1990, vol. 21, pp. 434–5. One more such developmental account of emotion has recently been suggested by R. Wollheim, *On the Emotions*, New Haven/London, Yale University Press, 1999. For him, a belief and a desire do not constitute emotion until they have developed into an *attitude*: a transformation of an 'original experience of satisfaction or frustration of desire' that is ultimately an activity of the imagination; see esp. pp. 74–81.

42 De Sousa, *The Rationality of Emotion*, p. 303.

43 Baier, 'What Emotions Are About', pp. 25–6.

44 Notably, not all cognitive theorists assume that there is no conflict between 'reason and passion'. For instance, Ben-Ze'ev, in *The Subtlety of Emotion*, often draws a distinction between the more detached and objective intellectual reasoning and the more limited, personal emotional reasoning; however, this is precisely a distinction that I question in s. 2.3.

45 Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, trans. T. Irwin, Indianapolis, Hackett Publ. Co., 1985, pp. 73–4 (1115b).

46 Aristotle, *On Rhetoric*, trans. G. A. Kennedy, New York/Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1991, esp. Book 2.

47 It could be argued that Aristotle nevertheless retains this distinction to some extent by exploring the moral virtues and vices mainly in the *Nicomachean Ethics*, but the emotions in the *Rhetoric*.

48 Solomon, 'Emotions and Choice', in *What Is an Emotion?*, pp. 317–20.

49 J. R. Averill, 'Studies on Anger and Aggression: Implications for Theories of Emotion', *American Psychologist*, 1983, vol. 38, p. 1145.

50 See further in J. D. Mayer and P. Salovey, 'Emotional Intelligence and the Construction and Regulation of Feelings', *Applied and Preventive Psychology*, 1995, vol. 4.

51 A. O. Rorty, 'Introduction', in A. O. Rorty (ed.) *Explaining Emotions*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1980, p. 1.

52 M. C. Nussbaum makes clever use of this example in 'Compassion: The Basic Social Emotion', *Social Philosophy and Policy*, 1996, vol. 13. Moreover, she elsewhere presents convincing evidence for the ubiquity of compassion as a human phenomenon. Descriptions and analyses of compassion, ranging from

the theoretical accounts of Aristotle and Rousseau to recent sociological data and to explorations of Asian cultural traditions, remain remarkably constant across place and time; The Gifford Lectures/*Upheavals of Thought*, ch. 6.

53 If we deny this, we end up in the excesses of radical postmodernism which deny the possibility of any authentic transcultural understanding, and perhaps even understanding between any two individuals, or within the same individual at different times, see s. 2.1.

54 For examples of non-universalist views of emotion and a critique to which I am indebted here, see A. Gibbard, *Wise Choices, Apt Feelings: A Theory of Normative Judgment*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1990, pp. 140–4.

55 In Old Icelandic, there exists a word, '*sampíning*', which has more or less the same connotation as 'compassion', but it is not a part of the existing vocabulary of most modern speakers.

56 See, for example, F. Waismann, 'Verifiability', *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, 1945, suppl. vol. 19.

57 Aristotle's often-quoted remark about our not looking 'for the same degree of exactness in all areas, but the degree that fits the subject-matter in each area and is proper to the investigation' is followed by a passage in which he compares the activity of the moral philosopher to that of the carpenter rather than the geometer, although both study 'the truth'; *Nicomachean Ethics*, p. 18 (1098a).

58 See further in K. Kristjánsson, *Social Freedom: The Responsibility View*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1996, ch. 7.

59 P. E. Griffiths, *What Emotions Really Are: The Problem of Psychological Categories,* Chicago/London, University of Chicago Press, 1997, goes even further than Rorty by suggesting that since the concept of emotion fails to refer to a natural kind, it 'should be discarded for the purposes of explanation and induction', p. 246. Much the same counter-argument applies here as I adduce against Rorty. Furthermore, the scattered pieces which remain of the vernacular emotion-concept after Griffiths's dissolution hardly seem less problematic or theoretically cumbersome than the referents of the original concept: some are explained by him as 'real' natural kinds via a sophisticated sensory theory (the 'affect program model'); others are explained as culturally-bound 'higher cognitive emotions' (yet to be more fully worked out), and yet others are explained (away) as 'socially sustained pretense emotions'.

60 See further in Kristjánsson, *Social Freedom*, ch. 7, where I argue for such a method of naturalistic critical revision along Aristotelian lines.

61 For an enlightening discussion of Aristotle's methodology, see M. C. Nussbaum, *The Fragility of Goodness*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1986, ch. 8.

62 Roberts, 'What an Emotion Is', p. 185.

63 Farrell, 'Jealousy', p. 531.

64 M. C. Nussbaum, 'Non-Relative Virtues: An Aristotelian Approach', in M. C. Nussbaum and A. Sen (eds) *The Quality of Life*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1993, p. 247.

65 Ben-Ze'ev, *The Subtlety of Emotions*, esp. pp. 6–11.

66 Ibid., p. 11.

67 Ibid., pp. 104ff.

68 Ibid., p. 104.

69 Power and Dalgleish, *Cognition and Emotion*, pp. 109–10.

70 G. E. M. Anscombe, 'On Brute Facts', in *The Collected Philosophical Papers of G. E. M. Anscombe*, III, *Ethics, Religion and Politics*, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1981.

71 See, for example, M. B. Arnold, *Emotion and Personality*, New York, Columbia University Press, 1960, p. 197. See also a further discussion in D. J. Sharpsteen, 'The Organization of Jealousy Knowledge: Romantic Jealousy as a Blended Emotion', in P. Salovey (ed.) *The Psychology of Jealousy and Envy*, New York/London, Guilford Press, 1991.

72 More commonly, the behaviour patterns are seen as incidental, and at least in the case of 'dispassionate' emotions such as hope, appearing merely as a desire; See, for example, Ben-Ze'ev*, The Subtlety of Emotions*, p. 61.

73 Ibid., ch. 3.

74 Ibid., p. 67.

75 J. Kovesi, *Moral Notions*, London, Routledge, 1971. See a further analysis of his view in Kristjánsson, *Social Freedom*, s. 7.2.

76 Kovesi, *Moral Notions*, p. 119.

77 Nussbaum, The Gifford Lectures/*Upheavals of Thought*, ch. 1.

78 Nussbaum, 'Compassion', pp. 37–8.

79 P. Foot, *Virtues and Vices and Other Essays in Moral Philosophy,* Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1978, p. 179. For a more detailed and technical (and exceptionally persuasive) defence of such 'motivational externalism', see S. Svavarsdóttir, 'Moral Cognitivism and Motivation', *Philosophical Review*, 1999, vol. 108. The disposition to be motivated by one's moral judgments is, in Svavarsdóttir's account, grounded in a conative attitude ('the desire to be moral'), p. 170. Similarly, as noted below, the experience of an emotion requires both a moral belief and a conative attitude.

80 Foot, *Virtues and Vices*. In the case of emotions (rather than moral actions with which Foot is concerned) it would perhaps be more apt to talk about 'hypothetical motivators' than 'hypothetical imperatives' for, as Ben-Ze'ev correctly notes, the concern-component in emotion need not be connected to actual behaviour, but rather (sometimes) only to a mere wish, never intended to be translated into actual behaviour; *The Subtlety of Emotions*, pp. 61–2.

81 Wollheim, *On the Emotions*, p. 15.

82 Recall that I am here talking about the desires which constitute components of emotions. We may have other desires which do not imply feelings because they are not intense or significant enough for us, witness e.g. P. Goldie's example of the 'desire' to reach out for one's spectacles and put them on; *The Emotions: A Philosophical Exploration*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 2000, p. 79. Although I am not as concerned as Goldie is with underlining the centrality of feelings in emotional experience, I am not an 'add-on theorist' in his sense, p. 40, that is, not one who thinks that the feeling-element in emotion is a simple psychological or physiological add-on to basic *feelingless* beliefs and desires.

83 Goldie invokes here the helpful notion of 'cognitive impenetrability', ibid., p. 76. In the light of my subsequent discussion, it might perhaps be even more helpful to talk about some emotions being 'non-self-deceptively cognitively impenetrable'.

84 I used to concur with this construal-solution, criticised below; see, for example, K. Kristjánsson, 'Why Persons Need Jealousy', *The Personalist Forum*, 1996, vol. 12.

85 N. Sherman, 'The Role of Emotions in Aristotelian Virtue', in J. J. Cleary and W. Wians (eds) *Proceedings of the Boston Area Colloquium in Ancient Philosophy*, 1993, vol. 9, pp. 12–15.

86 Aristotle, *De Anima*, trans. J. A. Smith, in W. D. Ross (ed.) *The Works of Aristotle*, III, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1931, 427b. One might ask whether 'imagining' is here similar enough to 'construal' to talk about it in the same breath; Sherman herself, interestingly enough, thinks so.

87 'Wilful' self-deception, where both the contradictory beliefs exist in our mind at the same time, is commonly distinguished from 'non-wilful' self-deception where only the false belief is held but potential outside sources, where we suspect that contrasting evidence lurks, are systematically ignored and avoided.

88 Roberts, 'What an Emotion Is', p. 197.

89 See, for example, R. Demos, 'Lying to Oneself', *Journal of Philosophy*, 1960, vol. 57. I elaborate on Demos's suggestions in Kristjánsson, *Social Freedom*, pp. 101–3.

90 For a detailed discussion of self-deception and emotions, see Solomon, *The Passions*, ch. 13.

91 M. C. Nussbaum, The Gifford Lectures/*Upheavals of Thought*, ch. 1. However, Nussbaum later gives in to the suggestion that animals and infants can experience emotions, which leads her to replace her account of evaluations as exclusively linguistically formulable beliefs with one of evaluations as 'recognitions'.

92 In some cases, the fear might even be better explained as a startle response, a pre-linguistic biological drive to stay out of reach of potentially poisonous animals, or a conditioned reflex, than as a real emotion; see below.

93 Power and Dalgleish, *Cognition and Emotion*, p. 152.

94 Ibid., pp. 174ff.

95 J. Deigh, 'Cognitivism in the Theory of Emotions', *Ethics*, 1994, vol. 104.

96 Ibid., p. 835.

97 R. S. Dillon, 'Self-Respect: Moral, Emotional, Political', *Ethics*, 1997, vol. 107.

98 Deigh, 'Cognitivism in the Theory of Emotions', p. 849.

99 On the difference between fear and startle-responses, which he refers to as the 'flight-arousal syndrome' common to many species of mammal, see R. Gordon, *The Structure of Emotions: Investigations in Cognitive Philosophy*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1987, pp. 71–2.

100 Ben-Ze'ev, *The Subtlety of Emotions*, p. 162.

101 See J. R. Averill, 'An Analysis of Psychophysiological Symbolism and Its Influence on Theories of Emotion', *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 1974, vol. 4.

102 Averill, 'Studies on Anger and Aggression', p. 1157.

103 I have worked out these distinctions in more detail elsewhere, see Kristjánsson, *Social Freedom*, ch. 4.

104 Solomon calls this the 'Myth of the Passions', and he wrote a whole big book to dismantle it: *The Passions*.

105 Oakley, *Morality and the Emotions*, pp. 128–9.

106 R. M. Adams, 'Involuntary Sins', *Philosophical Review*, 1985, vol. 94.

107 See Oakley, *Morality and the Emotions*, p. 172, for a fuller description of this truth.

108 Ibid., ch. 5.

109 Oakley suggests as much, see ibid., pp. 86–7.

110 R. de Sousa, 'The Rationality of Emotions', in A. O. Rorty (ed.) *Explaining Emotions*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1980, p. 133.

111 De Sousa, *The Rationality of Emotion*, p. 17.

112 The illogicality does not rest so much on the fact that the remorse is felt with regard to a *future* act (see my discussion of the possibility of forward-looking shame in s. 4.1) as on its allegedly being felt towards an act that we find morally *praiseworthy*.

113 J. D'Arms and D. Jacobson, 'The Moralistic Fallacy: On the "Appropriateness" of Emotions', *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*,

2000, vol. 61, esp. pp. 68–9. Somewhat unfortunately, they use the technical terms 'fittingness' or 'correctness' for what I have called 'rationality' of emotions, while reserving the term 'propriety' for what I call 'moral fittingness'. However, terminological differences put aside, I fully agree with their basic point that it is wrong to conflate 'correctness' with 'propriety'. Nevertheless, this line may sometimes be thinner than they assume. For instance, they consider certain emotional overreactions examples of 'unfittingness' (in their sense), while I would rather see those as examples of a lack of proportionality and hence a lack of moral propriety, as in their own case of a widowed person with young children who should (morally) only indulge in a moderate amount of sorrow, in order to help the children go on with their lives, pp. 74 and 77.

114 See A. O. Rorty, 'Explaining Emotions', in A. O. Rorty (ed.) *Explaining Emotions*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1980, p. 123, endnote 3.

115 If the evaluation theorist responds that a situation has not been correctly described from the moral point of view unless the intensity of the concern forms a part of the description, I would claim that this is obliterating the distinction between moral evaluation judgements and moral imperatives (see s. 1.3).

116 R. Hursthouse, 'Arational Actions', *Journal of Philosophy*, 1991, vol. 88.

117 Ben-Ze'ev, *The Subtlety of Emotions*, p. 68.

118 Ibid., p. 72.

119 Ibid., p. 95 and elsewhere.

120 Calhoun and Solomon, 'Introduction', p. 33.

121 See, for example, K. Karasawa's study of reactions to negative emotions, that is to negatively-evaluated emotions: 'An Attributional Analysis of Reactions to Negative Emotions', *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 1995, vol. 21. However, in Ben-Ze'ev's defence it might be said that his terminology also seems to be common in the psychology literature, See, for example, N. L. Stein and J. L. Jewett, 'A Conceptual Analysis of the Meaning of Negative Emotions: Implications for a Theory of Development', in C. E. Izard and P. B. Read (eds) *Measuring Emotions in Infants and Children*, II, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1986. Stein and Jewett incidentally seem to take such a terminology for granted; contrary to Ben-Ze'ev they neither explain nor argue for it, while (somewhat ironically) complaining at the same time that empirical difficulties in emotion research stem from the fact that many studies lack theoretical underpinnings, p. 238.

122 See, for example, Farrell, 'Of Jealousy and Envy', p. 262, on jealousy.

123 See, for example, Ben-Ze'ev, *The Subtlety of Emotions*, p. 262.

124 See, for example, de Sousa, *The Rationality of Emotion*, p. 321 (citing a view expressed by Laurence Thomas).

125 More commonly, however, in Western religions, we are offered a historical solution to the problem of evil, with our sufferings in this 'vale of tears' being explained as resulting from original sin, and our subsequent fall from a state of grace and innocence.

126 M. Stocker (with E. Hegeman), *Valuing Emotions,* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1996, pp. 235–7.

2 Justifying emotions

1 Cp. a similar claim made by Gabriele Taylor twenty years earlier: 'An ultimate justification for the division of the emotions along these lines [of justified vs.

unjustified] will of course amount to a justification of the moral system adopted'; 'Justifying the Emotions', *Mind*, 1975, vol. 84, p. 402.

2 This is the traditional 'literal' interpretation of Kant. For a less literal reading of Kant's 'real' view, more sympathetic to the emotions, see, for example, B. Herman, *The Practice of Moral Judgement*, Harvard, Harvard University Press, 1993, ch. 1. Herman's main point is that Kant is not, as is commonly thought, contrasting acting out of duty alone with acting out of duty accompanied by a co-operating emotional inclination, saying that only the former has moral worth; rather he is contrasting acting out of duty alone with acting out of an inclination without regard for moral duty, where the latter lacks moral worth. In this sense, an action's moral worth is not compromised by the presence of a co-operating emotion, as long as the emotion is not taken by the agent as the motive for acting.

3 J. Rawls, *A Theory of Justice*, London/New York, Oxford University Press, 1973.

4 See, for example, M. Sandel, *Liberalism and the Limits of Justice*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1982.

5 Rawls, *A Theory of Justice*, p. 396. Note that when Rawls speaks of 'self-respect', this must be taken to mean something akin to 'self-esteem' as specified later in this book (s. 3.1).

6 For an enlightening and critical discussion of the liberal notion of state neutrality, see G. Sher, *Beyond Neutrality: Perfectionism and Politics*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1997.

7 For a characteristically dithering account of the purpose of liberal education, see A. Gutmann, 'What's the Use of Going to School?', in A. Sen and B. Williams (eds) *Utilitarianism and Beyond*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1982.

8 See, for example, B. A. Sichel, *Moral Education: Character, Community, and Ideals*, Philadelphia, Temple University Press, 1988, p. 50.

9 For a more detailed distinction between liberal and postmodern pluralism/multiculturalism, see, for example, C. Taylor, 'The Politics of Recognition' in A. Gutmann (ed.) *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition*, Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press, 1994.

10 J. Rawls, 'Justice as Fairness: Political not Metaphysical', *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 1985, vol. 14, p. 225. G. Graham, 'Liberalism: Metaphysical, Political, Historical', *Philosophical Papers*, 1993, vol. 22, esp. p. 100, presents an enlightening account of the development of Rawls's liberal thought.

11 M. C. Nussbaum, 'Nature, Function, and Capability', *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy*, 1988, suppl. vol. 1; 'Recoiling from Reason' (Review of A. MacIntyre's *Whose Justice? Which Rationality*, *New York Review of Books*, 7 December 1989; 'Aristotelian Social Democracy', in R. B. Douglass, G. M. Mara and H. S. Richardson (eds) *Liberalism and the Good*, New York/London, Routledge, 1990; 'Human Functioning and Social Justice: In Defence of Aristotelian Essentialism', *Political Theory*, 1992, vol. 20; 'Non-Relative Virtues: An Aristotelian Approach', in M. C. Nussbaum and A. Sen (eds) *The Quality of Life*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1993; 'Aristotle on Human Nature and the Foundations of Ethics', in J. E. J. Altham and R. Harrison (eds) *World, Mind, and Ethics: Essays on the Ethical Philosophy of Bernard Williams*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1995.

12 Nussbaum, 'Aristotelian Social Democracy', p. 207.

13 For an overview of contemporary Aristotelianism, see J. R. Wallach, 'Contemporary Aristotelianism', *Political Theory*, 1992, vol. 20.

14 Nussbaum, 'Nature, Function, and Capability', p. 177.

15 Nussbaum, 'Aristotle on Human Nature', p. 106.

16 M. C. Nussbaum, 'The Gifford Lectures', given at the University of Edinburgh, 1993 (unpublished), lecture 5, forthcoming under the title *Upheavals of Thought: A Theory of the Emotions*, 2001 (unpublished draft). The quoted text is actually not included in the revised (2001) version (draft), but is cited here with the author's permission.

17 See, for example, Nussbaum, 'Aristotelian Social Democracy', p. 205.

18 Nussbaum, 'Nature, Function, and Capability', s. 5, and 'Aristotelian Social Democracy', p. 228.

19 See esp. Nussbaum, 'Human Functioning and Social Justice'.

20 I leave it an open question here to what extent Nussbaum's 'Aristotelian social democratic' policies reflect the views of the historical Aristotle and to what extent they rely on conjectures about how Aristotle would have argued had he lived in the present age. For our purposes, Nussbaum's views are interesting for the alternative they present to liberalism rather than as pieces of Aristotelian scholarship.

21 Nussbaum, 'Aristotelian Social Democracy', p. 214.

22 Nussbaum, 'Human Functioning and Social Justice', p. 229.

23 Nussbaum, 'Nature, Function, and Capability', p. 145; 'Aristotelian Social Democracy', p. 203.

24 Nussbaum, 'Aristotelian Social Democracy', pp. 240ff.

25 Ibid., p. 230.

26 Ibid., p. 217; pp. 234ff. However, in a surprising and somewhat disappointing twist, Nussbaum now seems to want to aim at an even further reconciliation with basic liberal tenets by saying that she has recently come to understand 'the list of basic human capabilities as the core of a specifically political form of liberalism, in the Rawlsian sense'; 'Political Animals: Luck, Love, and Dignity', *Metaphilosophy*, 1998, vol. 29, p. 284. See also her 'Aristotle, Politics, and Human Capabilities: A Response to Antony, Arneson, Charlesworth, and Mulgan', *Ethics*, 2000, vol. 111.

27 This was A. MacIntyre's challenging formulation in his widely influential *After Virtue*, Notre Dame, IN, University of Notre Dame Press, 1981. I basically agree that the choice is between Aristotle and Nietzsche, but MacIntyre's 'Nietzsche' that is, since I think that the real Nietzsche was much more of a moralist than MacIntyre realises.

28 R. Rorty, who calls himself a 'postmodernist bourgeois liberal', 'Postmodernist Bourgeois Liberalism', *Journal of Philosophy*, 1983, vol. 80, is a good example of the latter.

29 This 'list' of basic postmodern tenets draws mainly on D. Hebdige, *Hiding in the Light: On Images and Things*, London, Routledge, 1988, and R. Rorty, *Contingency, Irony, and Solidarity*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1989.

30 F. Jameson, 'The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism', in *Postmodernism, or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*, London\New York, Verso, 1991, based on an essay which originally appeared in 1984.

31 This change is also reflected in the development of postmodern art from the 'uncritical' pastiche art of the 1960s–'80s to the establishment of a new 'crit-ical\affirmative' (esp. feminist) art culture from the 1980s onwards, which allegedly aims at opening up new discursive spaces and subject positions outside the confines of established art practices, the art market, and modernist orthodoxy; see H. Foster, 'Postmodernism: A Preface', in H. Foster (ed.) *Postmodern Culture*, London/Sidney, Pluto Press, 1985.

32 C. West, 'The New Cultural Politics of Difference', in S. During (ed.) *The Cultural Studies Reader*, London, Routledge, 1993.

33 This paradox is memorably revealed in D. Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*, Oxford, Blackwell, 1990, esp. pp. 116–17.

34 Nussbaum, 'Human Functioning and Social Justice', pp. 237ff.

35 See E. Dissanayake, *Homo Aestheticus*, New York, Macmillan, 1992. Dissanayake argues in her book for an interesting version of artistic universalism which sees the arts as having functioned more or less the same way in every human society, as embellishment of the things we care about by making them 'special'.

36 On the varieties of goodness, nothing surpasses G. H. von Wright, *Varieties of Goodness*, London, Routledge, 1963.

37 I am not mainly arguing here from an (arguably) outdated 'introspection by analogy'; what matters more are the beliefs which my neighbour expressed in our conversations.

38 Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, trans. T. Irwin, Indianapolis, Hackett Publ. Co., 1985, p. 208 (1155a).

39 Cp. here D. Carr's, 'After Kohlberg: Some Implications of an Ethics of Virtue for the Theory of Moral Education and Development', *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 1996, vol. 15, especially his Aristotelian criticisms of Kohlberg's theories of moral education and development as stemming (like liberalism) from deontological (esp. Kantian) sources (see further in s. 6.2). While basically acquiescing in Carr's main points there, I think that he yields too much philosophical ground – and philosophical edge – to relativists, by calling the Aristotelian alternative 'anti-foundationalist' (as well as, for some reason, 'post-analytical'). This claim only goes through on such a narrow understanding of the term 'foundationalist' that the only possible ethical foundationalisms amount either to a deontological 'view from nowhere', or to a caricature of utilitarianism. Carr has here succumbed to a version of what M. C. Nussbaum calls 'the confused story' of recent developments in moral philosophy; 'Virtue Ethics: A Misleading Category?', *The Journal of Ethics*, 1999, vol. 3, pp. 163–4.

40 For a much more detailed Aristotelian response to moral relativism, see Nussbaum, 'Non-Relative Virtues'. Interestingly, L. Goodstein, ' "Declaration of a Global Ethic" Signed at Religious Parliament', *Washington Post*, 3 September 1993, reports that in September 1993, representatives of more than 125 different religions signed a 'Declaration of a Global Ethic'. The consensus reached on general moral issues was such that 'there was no objection to any important point'. So perhaps the extent of not only philosophical, but also religious, disagreement on moral issues tends to be over-emphasised.

41 On the varieties of contemporary virtue ethics, see J. Oakley, 'Varieties of Virtue Ethics', *Ratio*, 1996, vol. 9.

42 R. Hursthouse, for example, says this is one of the features that attracted her to *VE* in the first place; 'Virtue Ethics and the Emotions', in D. Statman (ed.) *Virtue Ethics*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 1997, p. 99.

43 The latter seems at least to be the *logical* order underlying J. Oakley's claims to this effect; *Morality and the Emotions*, London/New York, Routledge, 1992, pp. 39 and 186.

44 See, for example, D. Solomon, 'Internal Objections to Virtue Ethics', in D. Statman (ed.) *Virtue Ethics*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 1997, pp. 169ff.

45 B. Williams, *Moral Luck*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1981, pp. 40ff. Interestingly, the aim of his charge of self-indulgence was not to under-

mine *VE* but rather to turn the tables on utilitarians who are allegedly forced to subordinate their strongest personal commitments to people and causes to an all-embracing principle of utility, hence caring more about themselves as persons caring for a principle – which indirectly cares about others – than they directly care about others. I am not sure, however, that turning the tables on utilitarians in this way really works. Irrespective of the ultimate motivation for being a utilitarian, it is clear that the overarching virtue of utilitarianism, to be cultivated in the young and bolstered in the old, is a kind of a generalised benevolence towards others (s. 2.3). Thus, other-concerning acts and emotions will naturally take precedence over self-concerning ones.

46 For the phrase 'action-guiding objection' and a further analysis of the problem, see Solomon, 'Internal Objections to Virtue Ethics', pp. 169ff. Tellingly, for the state of the literature, the name Solomon gives this objection has no direct reference to *VE*'s failure to guide our emotions.

47 Such emotional conflicts involve not only a psychological problem and a moral problem but a conceptual one as well. D. Pugmire, 'Conflicting Emotions and the Indivisible Heart', *Philosophy*, 1996, vol. 71, argues convincingly against the possibility of true emotional ambivalence (i.e. 'the simultaneous focusing of opposed emotions on the very same feature of the same thing'). It is hard to understand (conceptually) how I could rejoice at a friend's good fortune and, in the midst of my rejoicing, also hope that he comes to grief; see esp. pp. 32–3.

48 P. Foot, *Virtues and Vices and Other Essays in Moral Philosophy*, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1978, p. 26.

49 See, for example, G. E. M. Anscombe, 'Modern Moral Philosophy', in *The Collected Philosophical Papers of G. E. M. Anscombe*, III, *Ethics, Religion and Politics*, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1981.

50 For a clever exposition of this and other 'dangling' distinctions, see S. Kagan, *The Limits of Morality*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1989.

51 Foot, *Virtues and Vices*, p. 29.

52 Ibid., pp. 26ff.

53 Ibid., p. 23.

54 Ibid., p. 27.

55 Ibid., pp. 28–29; also her 'Utilitarianism and the Virtues', *Mind*, 1985, vol. 94, pp. 197–8.

56 Foot, *Virtues and Vices*, p. 28.

57 See P. Foot, 'Morality, Action and Outcome', in T. Honderich (ed.) *Morality and Objectivity: A Tribute to J. L. Mackie*, London, Routledge, 1985.

58 For a fuller account of Foot's prevarications here, see A. Kenny, 'Philippa Foot on Double Effect', in R. Hursthouse, G. Lawrence and W. Quinn (eds) *Virtues and Reasons: Philippa Foot and Moral Theory*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1995, pp 82ff.

59 Foot, 'Utilitarianism and the Virtues', p. 206.

60 Anscombe, 'Modern Moral Philosophy', p. 39.

61 A. Bain's words: ' "Let justice be done though nature should collapse", is the highest flight of sentimentalism', provide some food for thought here; *The Emotions and the Will*, 4th edn, London, Longmans, Green, 1899, p. 278.

62 What, in principle, we are in control of are not the episodic occurrences of emotions but rather our emotional dispositions (recall s. 1.4).

63 R. Hursthouse, 'Virtue Theory and Abortion', *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 1991, vol. 20; 'Applying Virtue Ethics', in R. Hursthouse, G. Lawrence and W. Quinn (eds) *Virtues and Reasons: Philippa Foot and Moral Theory*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1995; 'Fallacies and Moral Dilemmas', *Argumentation*, 1995, vol. 9; 'Normative Virtue Ethics', in R. Crisp (ed.) *How Should One Live?*

Essays on the Virtues, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1996. For a more recent, unified statement of her views, see R. Hursthouse, *On Virtue Ethics*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1999.

64 Hursthouse, 'Virtue Theory and Abortion', p. 227; (1996), p. 25.
65 Hursthouse, 'Virtue Theory and Abortion', p. 230; 'Normative Virtue Ethics', p. 36.
66 This is a major point in her 'Fallacies and Moral Dilemmas'.
67 Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, p. 55 (1110a).
68 D. Statman, 'Hard Cases and Moral Dilemmas', *Law and Philosophy*, 1996, vol. 15, p. 138.
69 Hursthouse, 'Fallacies and Moral Dilemmas', p. 627.
70 See, for example, R. M. Hare's complaints about these fantastical stories; *Moral Thinking: Its Levels, Method, and Point*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1981, esp. pp. 47–51 and 131–42.
71 Hursthouse, 'Virtue Theory and Abortion', p. 231; 'Normative Virtue Ethics', pp. 28–9.
72 Hursthouse, 'Normative Virtue Ethics', p. 30.
73 Hursthouse, 'Applying Virtue Ethics', pp. 61–2.
74 Ibid., p. 74.
75 R. Halwani, 'Virtue Ethics and Adultery', *Journal of Social Philosophy*, 1998, vol. 29, p. 16.
76 Hursthouse, 'Applying Virtue Ethics', p. 62 (footnote 5).
77 Hursthouse, 'Fallacies and Moral Dilemmas', p. 631.
78 Hursthouse, 'Normative Virtue Ethics', p. 24.
79 Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, p. 44 (1106b-1107a).
80 In Plato's *Euthypro*, a central question posed is whether the gods do not approve the good because it is good, rather than it being good simply because the gods approve it.
81 M. Slote, *From Morality to Virtue*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1992, p. 89. See also D. Statman, 'Introduction to Virtue Ethics', in D. Statman (ed.) *Virtue Ethics*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 1997, p. 27.
82 Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, pp. 241; 36 (1164b; 1104a).
83 G. Pálsson and E. P. Durrenberger, 'To Dream of Fish: The Causes of Icelandic Skippers' Fishing Success', *Journal of Anthropological Research*, 1982, vol. 38; 'Systems of Production and Social Discourse: The Skipper Effect Revisited', *American Anthropologist*, 1990, vol. 92.
84 Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, p. 6 (1095b).
85 'To grasp what intelligence is we should first study the sort of people we call intelligent'; ibid., p. 153 (1140a).
86 H. Upton, 'On Applying Moral Theories', *Journal of Applied Philosophy*, 1993, vol. 10, p. 192.
87 Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, p. 281 (1176a).
88 Ibid., p. 20 (1099a).
89 For a fuller discussion, see M. C. Nussbaum, *The Fragility of Goodness*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1986, esp. pp. 82–5.
90 I criticise an attempt of the latter sort in K. Kristjánsson, 'Is There Something Wrong with "Free Action"?', *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 1998, vol. 10; see also my 'Reply to Pettit and Norman', *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 1998, vol. 10.
91 See, for example, K. Kristjánsson, *Social Freedom: The Responsibility View*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1996.
92 For an epoch-making exploration of how to measure freedom, see I. Carter, *A Measure of Freedom*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1999.

93 See, for example, Hursthouse, 'Fallacies and Moral Dilemmas', p. 631.
94 Hursthouse, 'Virtue Ethics and the Emotions', p. 99.
95 Foot, 'Utilitarianism and the Virtues', p. 205.
96 Aristotle, *On Rhetoric*, trans. G. A. Kennedy, New York/Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1991, p. 80 (1366b).
97 Still, it is difficult to see why, if we want our actions and emotions to confer benefit, we do not want them to confer as much benefit as possible (on this point, see Upton, 'On Applying Moral Theories', p. 192) – unless of course one thinks, as Foot famously but counter-intuitively does, that the notion of the 'best state of affairs' is devoid of any meaning; 'Utilitarianism and the Virtues', esp. pp. 198–9.
98 J. S. Mill, *Utilitarianism, Liberty, Representative Government*, London, J. M. Dent , 1931, esp. pp. 1–36.
99 This is one of the reasons why Nussbaum thinks it wrong to oppose virtue ethics to (classical) utilitarianism, as tends to be the received textbook wisdom; 'Virtue Ethics: A Misleading Category?', pp. 165–7.
100 Mill, *Utilitarianism, Liberty, Representative Government*, pp. 9, 17, 34–5.
101 There would be no disagreement between Mill and the professed anti-utilitarian (see below) Nussbaum about this label which she gives to the emotion of compassion; 'Compassion: The Basic Social Emotion', *Social Philosophy and Policy*, 1996, vol. 13.
102 Aristotle, *On Rhetoric*, book 2, ch. 8 (1385b).
103 Mill, *Utilitarianism, Liberty, Representative Government*, p. 59.
104 See end of s. 2.2; Hursthouse, 'Virtue Ethics and the Emotions', p. 115.
105 Mill, *Utilitarianism, Liberty, Representative Government*, p. 46 (footnote).
106 Bain, *The Emotions and the Will*. The first edition of Bain's book appeared in 1859, two years before Mill published his *Utilitarianism*.
107 A. Bain, *Moral Science: A Compendium of Ethics*, New York, D. Appleton, 1869, p. 40.
108 Mill, *Utilitarianism, Liberty, Representative Government*, pp. 48–9.
109 Hursthouse, 'Virtue Ethics and the Emotions', p. 115.
110 See A. Ben-Ze'ev, *The Subtlety of Emotions*, Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press, 2000, for example, pp. 19, 39. It should be noted, however, that Ben-Ze'ev considers the two perspectives, the personal\emotional and the detached/intellectual, to be two extreme points on a continuum having other intermediate perspectives which include aspects of these two extremes.
111 Oakley, *Morality and the Emotions*, p. 72.
112 For an intriguing criticism of this kind, see, for example, 'Persons, Character and Morality' in Williams, *Moral Luck*.
113 See, for example, H. Sidgwick, *Methods of Ethics*, New York, Dover Publications, 1966, pp. 258, 432, 434.
114 Bain, *The Emotions and the Will*, pp. 100–1.
115 Mill, *Utilitarianism, Liberty, Representative Government*, pp. 42, 13.
116 See, for example, N. B. Kapur, 'Why It Is Wrong to Be Always Guided by the Best: Consequentialism and Friendship', *Ethics*, 1991, vol. 101.
117 Cp. G. Scarrre's terse but subtle comment: 'Universal death is a high price to pay, even for self-respect'; 'Utilitarianism and Self-Respect', *Utilitas*, 1992, vol. 4, p. 40.
118 On this point, see R. Crisp and M. Slote, 'Introduction', in R. Crisp and M. Slote (eds) *Virtue Ethics*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1997, p. 8.
119 Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, pp. 20–1 (1099a).
120 Ibid., p. 276 (1174b).
121 Ibid., p. 7 (1095b).

122 Ibid., p. 20 (1099a).

123 Ibid., p. 272 (1173b).

124 I must thus concede to S. A. White that Aristotle's view 'stops well short of hedonism'; *Sovereign Virtue: Aristotle on the Relation Between Happiness and Prosperity*, Stanford, CA, Stanford University Press, 1992, p. 134. However, as I argue below, that concession may be rather insignificant for practical concerns.

125 See S. Wolf, 'Happiness and Meaning: Two Aspects of the Good Life', *Social Philosophy and Policy*, 1997, vol. 14, pp. 209, 211, 225.

126 Nussbaum, 'Aristotelian Social Democracy', p. 213; 'Nature, Function, and Capability', pp. 154–5. In a later work, Nussbaum makes it clear that the non-cognitive conception of emotion and desire that nowadays tends to be connected with utilitarianism, and which she abhors, was not Mill's view at all; 'Virtue Ethics: A Misleading Category?', p. 168.

127 Nussbaum, 'Human Functioning and Social Justice', p. 208.

128 Ibid., p. 213.

129 Cp. also my conceptual methodology of 'naturalistic revision', briefly described in s. 1.3; see further in Kristjánsson, *Social Freedom*, ss 7.2–7.3.

130 H. Putnam, *Realism with a Human Face*, Cambridge, Mass./London, Harvard University Press, 1990, p. 118. For a recent formidable defence of naturalism along similar lines, see Hursthouse, *On Virtue Ethics*, ch. 9.

131 See, for example, D. O. Brink, 'Mill's Deliberative Utilitarianism', *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 1992, vol. 21, ss 2–3.

132 T. Schapiro, 'What Is a Child?', *Ethics*, 1999, vol. 109, p. 716.

133 This is the basic point of Mill's famous principle of liberty in his 'On Liberty'; *Utilitarianism, Liberty, Representative Government.*

134 S. Brennan, 'Recent Work in Feminist Ethics', *Ethics*, 1999, vol. 109, p. 860.

135 We can leave it out of consideration here whether love is to be understood as a single emotion or a mixture of emotions and emotional attitudes, see s. 1.2.

136 G. E. M. Anscombe, 'Contraception and Chastity', *The Human World*, 1972, vol.7.

137 K. Kristjánsson, 'Casual Sex Revisited', *Journal of Social Philosophy*, 1998, vol. 29.

3 Something to be proud of

1 For an exploration of the notions of 'autarchy' and 'autonomy', originating in works by Stanley Benn but further developed in my theory of social freedom, see K. Kristjánsson, *Social Freedom: The Responsibility View*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1996, s. 5.5.

2 I am here alluding to figures and concepts familiar from discussions of free will, see R. S. Dillon, 'How to Lose Your Self-Respect', *American Philosophical Quarterly*, 1992, vol. 29, p. 129.

3 G. Taylor, for one, seems to vacillate between a psychological and a moral sense of integrity; *Pride, Shame, and Guilt*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1985, pp. 126ff.

4 For an overview, see R. S. Dillon, 'Introduction', in R. S. Dillon (ed.) *Dignity, Character, and Self-Respect*, London, Routledge, 1995.

5 Contrived science-fiction scenarios in which even such actions may be morally required as the lesser of two evils can be set aside here.

6 I did not mean then, nor do I mean now, that everyone falls unproblematically somewhere into this grid, nor do I claim to have exhausted the list of possible character types. For a fuller account of numerous character variations and of the 'fifty ways to lose your self-respect', see Dillon, 'How to Lose Your Self-Respect'.

7 For a clever and insightful elaboration of common emotion-metaphors, see Z. Kövecses, *Emotion Concepts*, New York, Springer-Verlag, 1990; on the 'container metaphor', see pp. 92ff.

8 See further in Dillon, 'Introduction', p. 32.

9 Ibid.; also E. Telfer, 'Self-Respect', in R. S. Dillon (ed.) *Dignity, Character, and Self-Respect*, London, Routledge, 1995.

10 Telfer, 'Self-Respect', p. 108.

11 See D. Sachs, 'How to Distinguish Self-Respect from Self-Esteem', *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 1981, vol. 10, p. 358.

12 Telfer, 'Self-Respect', pp. 109–10.

13 S. J. Massey, 'Is Self-Respect a Moral or a Psychological Concept?', *Ethics*, 1983, vol. 93, p. 247.

14 Taylor, *Pride, Shame, and Guilt*, pp 78–9.

15 T. E. Hill, 'Self-Respect Reconsidered', in R. S. Dillon (ed.) *Dignity, Character, and Self-Respect*, London, Routledge, 1995, pp. 119–20.

16 Dillon, 'Introduction', p. 27.

17 Dillon, 'How to Lose Your Self-Respect', p. 134.

18 Sachs, 'How to Distinguish Self-Respect from Self-Esteem', p. 348.

19 Ibid., p. 349.

20 Ibid., p. 348.

21 Ibid., pp. 351–4.

22 A. Bain, *The Emotions and the Will*, 4th ed., London, Longmans, Green, 1899, p. 205.

23 D. Hume, *An Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1975, p. 270.

24 Dillon, 'How to Lose Your Self-Respect', p. 136.

25 G. Scarre, 'Utilitarianism and Self-Respect', *Utilitas*, 1992, vol. 4, esp. pp. 33–4.

26 I use 'evaluation of one's self-respect' here and in the following as a short for 'evaluation of the extent to which one has fulfilled the demands set down by one's self-respect'.

27 Dillon, 'How to Lose Your Self-Respect', p. 132.

28 See, for example, Dillon, 'Introduction', p. 34.

29 Massey, 'Is Self-Respect a Moral or a Psychological Concept?'

30 Throughout, I shall refer to this virtue by its Greek name and to people possessing it as *megalopsychos* (sing.) and *megalopsychoi* (pl.), rather than using any of the available English translations, which are either cumbersome, do not capture well the spirit of the virtue, or beg questions about what its main components are. I amend references to T. Irwin's translation of Aristotle (*Nicomachean Ethics*, Indianapolis, Hackett Publ. Co., 1985) accordingly.

31 Ibid., pp. 97–8 (1123b).

32 Ibid.

33 For a further discussion, see H. J. Curzer, 'A Great Philosopher's Not So Great Account of Great Virtue: Aristotle's Treatment of "Greatness of Soul"', *Canadian Journal of Philosophy*, 1990, vol. 20, p. 527.

34 Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, p. 99 (1124a).

35 Ibid., pp. 98–9 (1123b).

36 Ibid., pp. 99–100 (1124a).

37 In K. Kristjánsson, 'Liberating Moral Traditions: Saga Morality and Aristotle's *Megalopsychia*', *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice*, 1998, vol. 1, I argue that a similar component is to be found in the main character ideal of 'saga morality' (the moral tradition enshrined in northern Europe's oldest living literature, the Icelandic sagas): the ideal of *mikilmennska* ('great-mindedness'). I also argue,

by dint of various examples from Aristotle and the sagas, respectively, that the insights from those historically distinct moral realms, when juxtaposed, enhance one another.

38 See various interesting quotations presented in D. t. D. Held, '*Megalopsychia* in *Nicomachean Ethics* iv', *Ancient Philosophy*, 1993, vol. 13, p. 97, where Aristotle is even charged with 'emotional poverty', and with not being 'a nice or a good man', on account of his description of *megalopsychia* as the supreme moral virtue.

39 Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, pp. 101–2 (1124b).

40 W. F. R. Hardie, ' "Magnanimity" in Aristotle's Ethics', *Phronesis*, 1978, vol. 23,, for example, literally says that the *megalopsychos* is made to seem 'self-admiring, contemptuous and aloof, detached and uninvolved, ungrateful, inactive', p. 73.

41 H. J. Curzer, 'Aristotle's Much Maligned *Megalopsychos*', *Australasian Journal of Philosophy*, 1991, vol. 69.

42 Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, p. 100 (1124a).

43 Ibid., p. 104 (1125b).

44 Ibid., pp. 101–2 (1124b).

45 Ibid.

46 Ibid., p. 101 (1124b).

47 Hardie, ' "Magnanimity" in Aristotle's Ethics', p. 65.

48 Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, p. 101 (1124b).

49 Ibid., p. 207 (1155a).

50 Ibid., p. 102 (1125a).

51 R. Taylor's well-known defence of 'pride' as a moral virtue (*Ethics, Faith, and Reason*, Englewood Cliffs, N.J., Prentice-Hall, 1985, ch. 15) is, for example, primarily a splendid explication and defence of Aristotle's *megalopsychia*, rather than of 'pridefulness' (let alone 'simple pride') as specified in the present book.

52 S. A. White, for example, calls it such; *Sovereign Virtue: Aristotle on the Relation Between Happiness and Prosperity*, Stanford, CA, Stanford University Press, 1992, pp. 250ff.

53 Sachs, 'How to Distinguish Self-Respect from Self-Esteem', p. 350.

54 Cp. Bain's description of 'Pride, in its best signification'; *The Emotions and the Will*, p. 207.

55 J. Neu, 'Pride and Identity', in R. C. Solomon (ed.) *Wicked Pleasures: Meditations on the Seven 'Deadly' Sins*, New York, Rowman & Littlefield Publ., 1999, describes well such transvaluation, and it seems that in the end his defence of pride is of pride as self-respect rather than as pridefulness, in the sense given to it here.

56 A. Ben-Ze'ev, *The Subtlety of Emotions*, Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press, 2000, p. 510.

57 Ibid., p. 512. However, Ben-Ze'ev concedes elsewhere that in ordinary language 'we sometimes use shame also to refer to specific deeds', p. 491.

58 This crude distinction is commonly invoked by anthropologists. Surprisingly, as insightful and critical a philosopher as G. Taylor seems to take it for given; *Pride, Shame, and Guilt*, pp. 54ff.

59 Ibid., p. 77.

60 J. Kekes, 'Shame and Moral Progress', *Midwest Studies in Philosophy*, 1988, vol. 13, p. 286.

61 Sachs, 'How to Distinguish Self-Respect from Self-Esteem', p. 356.

62 On self-respect as an independent source of simple pride and self-esteem, see ibid., pp. 355–6.

63 Taylor, *Pride, Shame, and Guilt*, p. 83.
64 Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, p. 115 (1128b).
65 Ibid.

4 In defence of pridefulness

1 For some thoughtful reflections on shame-education, see D. Tombs, ' "Shame" as a Neglected Value in Schooling', *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 1995, vol. 29.

2 These philosophers tend to take as their starting points somewhat vague and streamlined conceptions abroad in the philosophical literature of the moralities of 'ancients' and 'moderns'. I shall, for convenience's sake, do the same. It may be controversial, however, to what extent Aristotelianism can be equated with 'the ancient moral outlook', for there are obviously ancient moral theories such as those of Plato and the Stoics which embody conceptions radically different from those of Aristotle (and arguably from those of most ordinary ancients), for example about the relationship between moral achievement and moral luck. For our present purposes, it can be left open to the reader who is sceptical about the homogeneity of ancient moral points of view to understand the following references to *ancient* morality as applying primarily to *Aristotelian* morality.

3 J. Casey, *Pagan Virtue: An Essay in Ethics*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1990, p. 226; B. Williams, *Shame and Necessity*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1993, pp. 4, 91. See also H. J. Curzer, 'Aristotle's Much Maligned *Megalopsychos*', *Australasian Journal of Philosophy*, 1991, vol. 69, pp. 131–51, where Curzer argues, among other things, that Aristotle's account of *megalopsychia* is not, as is commonly thought, at variance with Christian virtues.

4 See, for example, C. Cordner, 'Aristotelian Virtue and Its Limitations', *Philosophy*, 1994, vol. 69, esp. pp. 294–7.

5 K. Kristjánsson, 'Liberating Moral Traditions: Saga Morality and Aristotle's *Megalopsychia*', *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice*, 1998, vol. 1.

6 For example, I do not understand why Aristotle wants to claim that the *megalopsychos* 'counts nothing great', and that he 'seems to have slow movements, a deep voice and calm speech'; *Nicomachean Ethics*, trans. T. Irwin, Indianapolis, Hackett, 1985, pp. 102–3 (1125a) – a remark which perhaps involves a humorous reference to some of Aristotle's contemporaries.

7 Thus, I do not agree with C. Tollefsen, 'Self-Assessing Emotions and Platonic Fear', *International Philosophical Quarterly*, 1997, vol. 37, 'that shame based upon false or impoverished moral commitments will not really be shame in the fullest sense of the word', since a self-assessing emotion of a self already degraded will as such 'lack intelligibility', p. 311. The self of a Don Giovanni is not necessarily degraded in the same sense as that of the 'shit-eater' in s. 3.1; it can still be the self of an 'aristocrat', although it is morally reprehensible. See further comments on the possibility of self-respect in a consistent evildoer in s. 3.1.

8 A. Ben-Ze'ev, *The Subtlety of Emotions*, Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press, 2000, p. 528.

9 The view that I am opposing here is suggested, for example, by J. Kekes, 'Shame and Moral Progress', *Midwest Studies in Philosophy*, 1988, vol. 13, p. 292, and Tollefsen, 'Self-Assessing Emotions and Platonic Fear', p. 309.

10 On the forward-looking aspect of pride, see T. Smith, 'The Practice of Pride', *Social Philosophy and Policy*, 1998, vol. 15, inspired by the philosophy of Ayn

Rand, esp. pp. 75 and 81. However, the spirit of what she says about pride as part of a 'practiced drive to be moral' would sometimes be better captured if she distinguished between (simple) pride and pridefulness and replaced the former, in her discussion, with the latter.

11 D. Hume, *Enquiries Concerning the Human Understanding and Concerning the Principles of Morals*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1972, p. 276.

12 G. Taylor, *Pride, Shame, and Guilt*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1985, pp. 134–5.

13 Williams, *Shame and Necessity*, pp. 81ff.

14 D. t. D. Held, '*Megalopsychia* in *Nicomachean Ethics* iv', *Ancient Philosophy*, 1993, vol. 13, p. 104. Held is here quoting the sociologist P. Bourdieu.

15 Williams, *Shame and Necessity*, pp. 90ff.

16 Kekes, 'Shame and Moral Progress', pp. 282, 291–5.

17 Such an objection is pointedly expressed by Cordner, 'Aristotelian Virtue and Its Limitations', pp. 299–304.

18 Ibid., pp. 303–4, 315.

19 Notably, emphasising the social embeddedness of moral values does not commit one to the view that such values are necessarily relative to particular societies (see s. 2.1).

20 A. O. Rorty, ' "Pride Produces the Idea of Self" : Hume on Moral Agency', *Australasian Journal of Philosophy*, 1990, vol. 68, p. 257.

21 As well as referring, at times, to a person's self-respect (see previous section).

22 J. Neu, 'Pride and Identity', in R. C. Solomon (ed.) *Wicked Pleasures: Meditations on the Seven 'Deadly' Sins*, New York, Rowman & Littlefield, 1999, p. 52. However, Neu may here be more concerned with our collective social identity than with the formation of personhood, and there I take exception to some of his claims, see s. 4.2.

23 Symbolic interactionism derives from the works of G. H. Mead, esp. *Mind, Self and Society*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1934.

24 See Rorty, ' "Pride Produces the Idea of Self" ', p. 263.

25 D. Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1978, pp. 287, 303. I assume that Hume is here talking about pridefulness although he uses the more familiar word 'pride'.

26 On the idea of 'existential connections' as person-defining in Hume, and of pridefulness (or what Hume simply called 'pride') as the chief mechanism by which we recognise such connections, see D. C. Ainslie, 'Scepticism About Persons in Book II of Hume's *Treatise*', *Journal of the History of Philosophy*, 1999, vol. 37, esp. pp. 477–83.

27 A. MacIntyre, 'Plain Persons and Moral Philosophy: Rules, Virtues and Goods', *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly*, 1992, vol. 66, p. 14.

28 Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, p. 100 (1124a).

29 Mark 12: 42–3. Casey, *Pagan Virtue*, explores this and other biblical examples; pp. 207–8.

30 H. Curzer, 'A Great Philosopher's Not So Great Account of Great Virtue: Aristotle's Treatment of "Greatness of Soul" ', *Canadian Journal of Philosophy*, 1990, vol. 20, pp. 520–1.

31 Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, p. 93 (1122a).

32 Ibid., p. 290 (1179a).

33 Ibid., p. 21 (1099a).

34 Ibid., p. 21 (1099b). Cp. here also M. C. Nussbaum's neo-Aristotelian 'minimal theory of the good', described in s. 2.1, where she provides, among other things, a list of basic human capabilities that must be satisfied in order for a good human life to be lived; 'Aristotelian Social Democracy', in R. B. Douglass, G.

M. Mara and H. S. Richardson (eds) *Liberalism and the Good*, New York/London, Routledge, 1990, pp. 224–5.

35 Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, pp. 25–6 (1100b–1101a).

36 See esp. T. Nagel, *Mortal Questions*, New York, Cambridge University Press, 1979, ch. 3, and B. Williams, *Moral Luck*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1981, ch. 2.

37 On the different kinds of luck, see, for example, Ben-Ze'ev, *The Subtlety of Emotions*, pp. 211–12, as well Nagel, *Mortal Questions*, ch. 3, and Williams, *Moral Luck*, ch. 2.

38 I have discussed this at some length elsewhere. See K. Kristjánsson, *Social Freedom: The Responsibility View*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1996, ch. 4.

39 For an exploration of upward mobility and the jockeying for positions within social groups in the Icelandic sagas, see T. M. Andersson and W. I. Miller, *Law and Literature in Medieval Iceland: Ljósvetninga saga and Valla-Ljóts Saga*, Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1989, pp. 10–11, 16–17. See also my 'Liberating Moral Traditions' (1998).

40 For the contrary view, of *megalopsychia* as a 'privileged virtue', see, for example, N. Sherman, 'Common Sense and Uncommon Virtue', *Midwest Studies in Philosophy*, 1988, vol. 13, p. 103.

41 Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, p. 53 (1109b).

42 Ibid., p. 68 (1114a).

43 Ibid., pp. 100–1 (1124a–b).

44 Ibid., p. 290 (1179a).

45 Ibid., p. 70 (1114b).

46 See, for example, Ben-Ze'ev, *The Subtlety of Emotions*, p. 517.

47 Neu, 'Pride and Identity', p. 56.

48 Ibid., p. 75.

49 Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, pp. 172–3 (1145a).

50 Ibid., p. 72 (1115a).

51 Ibid., p. 72 (1115b).

52 Aristotle, *Posterior Analytics*, trans. G. R. G. Mure, in R. McKeon (ed.) *The Basic Works of Aristotle*, New York, Random House, 1941, p. 179 (97b).

53 At least according to Alcibiades in the *Symposium*; Plato, *Symposium*, trans. M. Joyce, in E. Hamilton and H. Cairns (eds) *The Collected Dialogues*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1961, pp. 571–2 (220–221).

54 Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, p. 26 (1100b).

55 Even so, for a (guarded) defence of an Aristotelian account of bravery, see Casey, *Pagan Virtue*, ch. 2.

56 Ibid., p. 71.

57 M. Ridge refuses to consider modesty a virtue between two vices because the humble person can still count as modest: he will simply be called 'too modest'; 'Modesty as a Virtue', *American Philosophical Quarterly*, 2000, vol. 37, p. 277. I do not think that we need to make such heavy weather of ordinary language here; it seems reasonable to consider the expression 'too modest' in ordinary language as an imprecise tag for 'not modest but rather humble'.

58 See Smith, 'The Practice of Pride', p. 79.

59 Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, p. 102 (1125a).

60 Curzer, 'Aristotle's Much Maligned *Megalopsychos*', pp. 147–9.

61 Various examples of this common way of thinking are provided by S. Hare, 'The Paradox of Moral Humility', *American Philosophical Quarterly*, 1996, vol. 33, see esp. footnote 4, p. 241.

62 Ben-Ze'ev, *The Subtlety of Emotions*, pp. 519–20.
63 Ibid., p. 523.
64 See Hare, 'The Paradox of Moral Humility'.
65 A. T. Nuyen, 'Just Modesty', *American Philosophical Quarterly*, 1998, vol. 35, esp. pp. 102, 107–8.
66 Unless, of course, one thinks of every accomplishment as a 'gift'. Neu comes close to defending such blatant, and in my view unreasonable, determinism: 'After all, traced far enough, even apparent achievements depend on conditions outside one's control'; 'Pride and Identity', p. 57.
67 For this subtle distinction, I am indebted to Hare, 'The Paradox of Moral Humility', pp. 239–40.
68 Williams, *Shame and Necessity*, p. 166.
69 Smith, 'The Practice of Pride', p. 87.
70 G. F. Schueler, 'Why IS Modesty a Virtue', *Ethics*, 1999, vol. 109, p. 838.

5 In defence of jealousy

1 D. M. Farrell, 'Of Jealousy and Envy', in G. Graham and H. Lafollette (eds) *Person to Person*, Philadelphia, Temple University Press, 1989, p. 245.
2 Ibid., p. 262.
3 G. Taylor, 'Envy and Jealousy: Emotions and Vices', *Midwest Studies in Philosophy*, 1988, vol. 13, p. 244. For a recent more positive look at jealousy, but still short of the defence that I offer, see P. Goldie, *The Emotions: A Philosophical Exploration*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 2000, briefly discussed in s. 5.4
4 The only previous suggestion to this effect that I have come across in the literature is in M. J. Wreen's paper, 'Jealousy', *Noûs*, 1989, vol. 23: 'Jealousy *could be*, for all I've argued, a species of envy', p. 648.
5 The conceptual account of jealousy proposed below is somewhat more complicated and I hope considerably more subtle than the one I offered in K. Kristjánsson, 'Why Persons Need Jealousy', *The Personalist Forum*, 1996, vol. 12.
6 For this simple but convincing distinction between covetousness and envy, see A. Ben-Ze'ev, *The Subtlety of Emotions*, Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press, 2000, p. 303.
7 See, for example, Farrell, 'Of Jealousy and Envy', pp. 253, 263.
8 Aristotle, *On Rhetoric*, trans. G. A. Kennedy, New York/Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1991, pp. 160–2 (1388a–b).
9 Ibid., p. 161 (1388a).
10 For example, D. M. Farrell, 'Jealousy', *The Philosophical Review*, 1980, vol. 89, pp. 529ff.
11 Goldie, *The Emotions*, describes this difference as one between 'particular' and 'general' envy, p. 27.
12 Farrell, 'Jealousy', p. 531.
13 Ibid., p. 532.
14 To be sure, 'envy' in ordinary language often signifies invidious envy, a fact which may have influenced Aristotle's treatment of the emotion. However, this is not always the case, for as we have seen 'envy' is also commonly used as a synonym for 'emulation'. It is thus in vain for those who believe in a single emotion called 'envy' to look to ordinary language for support.
15 Aristotle, *On Rhetoric*, p. 155 (1386b).
16 See H. J. Curzer, 'Aristotle's Account of the Virtue of Justice', *Apeiron*, 1995, vol. 28, pp. 233ff.
17 Ibid.
18 Ben-Ze'ev, *The Subtlety of Emotions*, ch. 12.

19 J. Portmann, *When Bad Things Happen to Other People*, New York/London, Routledge, 2000, p. 4. No doubt, Portmann's and Ben-Ze'ev's conception does rely on *one* of the uses of *Schadenfreude* abroad in ordinary language, witness for instance a recent *Newsweek*-article describing 'Silicon Valley's Latest Craze: Schadenfreude', namely, the pleasure experienced by those left out of the New Economy boom over the deserved fall of arrogant dot-com buffs; see K. Breslau, 'Silicon Valley's Latest Craze: Schadenfreude', *Newsweek*, Nov. 6, 2000. However, *Schadenfreude* also refers commonly in everyday discourse to pleasure over undeserved misfortune, and I take it to be in the interest of conceptual clarity to focus on that use of the term, at least in the present context.

20 Aristotle, *On Rhetoric*, p. 124 (1378a).

21 I presuppose such a narrow understanding of 'obligation' in the following. The reason why it is generally advisable, in a moral discourse, to rely on a narrow understanding of 'obligation' is explained in K. Kristjánsson, *Social Freedom: The Responsibility View*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1996, ch. 4.

22 For a useful discussion of this distinction, and desert claims in general, see G. Sher, *Desert*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1987.

23 The idea of jealousy as a compound emotion is not novel, see D. J. Sharpsteen, 'The Organization of Jealousy Knowledge: Romantic Jealousy as a Blended Emotion', in P. Salovey (ed.) *The Psychology of Jealousy and Envy*, New York\London, Guilford Press, 1991. However, Sharpsteen takes jealousy to be a singular blend of anger, sadness, and fear. I disagree because of both the constitutive emotions that he leaves out and some of those that he keeps in; see, for example, my criticism of fear as an element in jealousy in the following section.

24 See, for example, Farrell, 'Jealousy', pp. 540–1.

25 Depending on circumstances, we can here be talking about an identical or a similar enough favour, from a particular unique C, or from one or more of a set of unique Cs, see earlier.

26 Cited in van Sommers, *Jealousy*, London, Penguin, 1988, p. 1.

27 R. Lloyd, *Closer and Closer Apart: Jealousy in Literature*, Ithaca/London, Cornell University Press, 1995, pp. 2–3.

28 Ben-Ze'ev, *The Subtlety of Emotions*, esp. pp. 281, 290.

29 Ibid., p. 299.

30 See examples in W. G. Parrott and R. H. Smith, 'Distinguishing the Experiences of Envy and Jealousy', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1993, vol. 64, p. 907.

31 Ibid.

32 P. Salovey and J. Rodin, 'The Differentiation of Social-Comparison Jealousy and Romantic Jealousy', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1986, vol. 50.

33 W. G. Parrott, 'The Emotional Experiences of Envy and Jealousy', in P. Salovey (ed.) *The Psychology of Jealousy and Envy*, New York/London, Guilford Press, 1991, p. 23.

34 See, for example, Taylor, 'Envy and Jealousy', p. 240; J. Neu, 'Jealous Thoughts', in A. O. Rorty (ed.) *Explaining Emotions*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1980, p. 443; Ben-Ze'ev, *The Subtlety of Emotions*, pp. 289–90.

35 Wreen, 'Jealousy', p. 642.

36 This distinction is worked out, for example, by W. G. Parrott, 'The Emotional Experiences of Envy and Jealousy' and R. G. Bringle, 'Psychosocial Aspects of Jealousy: A Transactional Model', in P. Salovey (ed.) *The Psychology of Jealousy and Envy*, New York/London, Guilford Press, 1991.

37 See Farrell, 'Jealousy', p. 538.

38 Ibid., p. 530.

39 Of course, *A* might by chance be right, but since the reasons for this belief are insufficiently grounded, the jealousy counts as irrational (see s. 1.4).

40 Ben-Ze'ev, *The Subtlety of Emotions*, p. 298.

41 I consulted five standard English-English dictionaries, and those which gave examples concurred in that the locution 'jealous of' refers to the rival, not to the person meting out the favours. To be fair to Ben-Ze'ev, however, his use of the locution is not unknown in the literature. At least D. M. Buss uses 'jealous of' in this way, restricting what I call 'jealousy' to a special category: 'rival jealousy'; *The Dangerous Passion: Why Jealousy Is as Necessary as Love and Sex*, New York, The Free Press, 2000,, for example, pp. 30 and 69. Goldie, *The Emotions*, steers a kind of a middle course here by focusing on *A*'s jealousy *of the relationship* between *B* and *C*. He considers jealousy not as a three-party relation, but rather as being directed towards 'a narrative – a sequence of event', pp. 13 and 225.

42 See, for example, Farrell, 'Jealousy', p. 530.

43 Ben-Ze'ev claims that 'the lesser significance of the rival is expressed by the fact that the rival can be imaginary'; *The Subtlety of Emotions*, p. 290. However, *C* can also be 'imaginary', i.e. 'Luck', 'Providence', 'God', or even an envisioned set of some important persons (only existing, as a set, in *A*'s mind) that are supposed to favour *B* unduly vis-à-vis *A*.

44 This typical case, presented by S. A. Bers and J. Rodin, 'Social-Comparison Jealousy: A Developmental and Motivational Study', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1984, vol. 47, is further discussed in ss 5.3 and 6.4.

45 Farrell, 'Of Jealousy and Envy', p. 256.

46 Farrell, 'Jealousy', p. 558.

47 See Ben-Ze'ev, *The Subtlety of Emotions*, p. 312.

48 See also research mentioned by Ben-Ze'ev (ibid.) indicating that people would prefer their spouses to have sexual intercourse with a physically attractive than with an unattractive rival.

49 On the nature of 'reference groups' in emotions which involve interpersonal comparisons, see ibid., p. 133.

50 Ibid., pp. 284–5. For the view under attack see A. Ortony *et al.*, *The Cognitive Structure of Emotions*, New York, Cambridge University Press, 1988, pp. 101–2.

51 Neu, 'Jealous Thoughts', pp. 441ff; Wreen, 'Jealousy', p. 638.

52 Wreen, ibid.

53 Ibid., p. 647.

54 Ben-Ze'ev, *The Subtlety of Emotions*, p. 295.

55 Ibid., p. 287.

56 Ibid., p. 288.

57 By this I am not saying that all normative claims are necessarily moral (for instance aesthetic claims are normative without being moral), but desert claims form an important, inseparable part of moral discourse.

58 Ben-Ze'ev, *The Subtlety of Emotions*, p. 305.

59 R. H. Smith, 'Envy and the Sense of Injustice', in P. Salovey (ed.) *The Psychology of Jealousy and Envy*, New York/London, Guilford Press, 1991, esp. pp. 82, 85, 89.

60 Cp. the trenchant criticism made by J. D'Arms and D. Jacobson of the 'moralism' inherent in much of the recent literature on the emotions, where moral considerations are allowed to 'take over the entirety of evaluative space',

'The Moralistic Fallacy: On the "Appropriateness" of Emotions', *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 2000, vol. 61, p. 75.

61 Ben-Ze'ev, *The Subtlety of Emotions*, pp. 290, 297ff.

62 Bers and Rodin, 'Social-Comparison Jealousy'.

63 Lloyd, *Closer and Closer Apart*, p. 3 (citing a passage by Hanna Segal).

64 Ibid., p. 1 (quoting Harold Bloom).

65 Ibid., pp. 186–187.

66 Van Sommers, *Jealousy*, p. 17.

67 Ibid., p. 3.

68 Farrell, 'Jealousy', p. 556; 'Of Jealousy and Envy', p. 261.

69 See, for example, Taylor, 'Envy and Jealousy', pp. 245–6.

70 See, for example, Neu, 'Jealous Thoughts', p. 442.

71 Cited in Ben-Ze'ev, *The Subtlety of Emotions*, p. 300.

72 D. M. Farrell, 'Jealousy and Desire', in R. E. Lamb (ed.) *Love Analyzed*, Boulder, Westview Press, 1997, p. 169.

73 Ibid., p. 180.

74 Ibid., esp. pp. 184 and 186.

75 Cited in van Sommers, *Jealousy*, p. 45.

76 Buss, *The Dangerous Passion*, p. 47.

77 On legitimate expectations, as part of a relationship between lovers, see Goldie, *The Emotions*, p. 237.

78 Ben-Ze'ev, *The Subtlety of Emotions*, p. 292.

79 On the difference between having a (prima facie) obligation to do *x* and being reasonably expected to do *x*, see Kristjánsson, *Social Freedom*, ch. 4.

80 Of course, there are even more serious cases of irrational jealousy abroad, such as 'symptomatic jealousy' as a consequence of a major mental illness, and 'pathological jealousy', resulting from a personality disorder; see G. L. White and P. E. Mullen's diagnoses, *Jealousy: Theory, Research, and Clinical Strategies*, New York/London, Guilford Press, 1989. However, there is no particular reason to believe that such abnormal occurrences are more common in sexual jealousy than in other forms of the emotion.

81 Lloyd is the author of this juicy description of the irrationality of sexual jealousy; *Closer and Closer Apart*, pp. 31–2.

82 Buss, *The Dangerous Passion*, p. 207. I say this despite being strongly opposed to Buss's evolutionary account of jealousy, see my ch. 7.

83 R. Nozick, *Anarchy, State and Utopia*, New York, Basic Books, 1974, pp. 239–46.

84 'Cultures in tropical paradises that are entirely free of jealousy exist only in the romantic minds of optimistic anthropologists, and in fact have never been found' is Buss's apt remark here; *The Dangerous Passion*, p. 32.

85 See van Sommers, *Jealousy*, pp. 67–74.

86 Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, trans. T. Irwin, Indianapolis, Hackett, 1985, p. 44 (1106b). For a clever exposition of Aristotle's parameters, see Curzer, 'Aristotle's Account of the Virtue of Justice', pp. 218–19.

87 Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, p. 44 (1106b).

88 Ibid., pp. 105–6 (1126a).

89 Ibid., p. 105 (126a).

90 Bain, *The Emotions and the Will*, 4th edn, London, Longmans, Green, 1899, p. 190. Ben-Ze'ev does not go as far in his justification, but he considers anger at least 'more acceptable than hate', as the former is less comprehensive, and directed at specific actions rather than at the person as a whole; *The Subtlety of Emotions*, p. 400.

91 Aristotle, *On Rhetoric*, p. 157 (1387a).
92 St. T. Aquinas, *The Summa Theologica*, part II (9), trans. Fathers of the English Dominican Province, London, Burns Oates & Washbourne, 1912–1936, p. 476 (Q. 36, Art. 2).
93 Aristotle, *On Rhetoric*, p. 158 (1387b).
94 Cp. E. Telfer, 'Self-Respect', in R. S. Dillon (ed.) *Dignity, Character, and Self-Respect*, London, Routledge, 1995, p. 111.
95 B. R. Boxill, 'Self-Respect and Protest, in R. S. Dillon (ed.) *Dignity, Character, and Self-Respect*, London, Routledge, 1995.
96 On how being too eager to forgive can be seen as a vice indicative of diminished self-respect, see D. Novitz, 'Forgiveness and Self-Respect', *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 1998, vol. 58, esp. pp. 209, 312–14.
97 See E. R. Pinta, 'Pathological Tolerance', *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 1978, vol. 135.
98 In an interesting study of anger, J. R. Averill found that 76 per cent of his targets said that they came to realise their own faults because of the other person's anger. Furthermore, Averill says, 'the target's relationship with the angry person was reportedly strengthened more often than it was weakened (in 48% vs. 35% of the episodes), and the targets more often gained rather than lost respect for the angry person (in 44% vs. 29% of the episodes)'; 'Studies on Anger and Aggression: Implications for Theories of Emotion', *American Psychologist*, 1983, vol. 38, p. 1151.
99 See Ben-Ze'ev, *The Subtlety of Emotions*, p. 325.
100 See J. Casey, *Pagan Virtue: An Essay in Ethics*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1990, p. 28.
101 For this important point I am indebted to D. H. Frank, 'Anger as a Vice: A Maimonidean Critique of Aristotle's Ethics', *History of Philosophy Quarterly*, 1990, vol. 7, p. 273.
102 See R. de Sousa, *The Rationality of Emotion*, Cambridge, Mass./London, MIT Press, 1987, p. 17.
103 Goldie, *The Emotions*, pp. 3, 4, 16, 154, 221, 235–7, and 240.
104 See, for example, Farrell, 'Of Jealousy and Envy', p. 264.
105 Ben-Ze'ev, *The Subtlety of Emotions*, p. 283.
106 Cp. Neu, 'Jealous Thoughts', p. 437.
107 De Sousa, *The Rationality of Emotion*, p. 315.
108 It is important to distinguish pleasure-in-others'-misfortune from *Schadenfreude* which only refers to pleasure in others'-*undeserved*-misfortune. Ben-Ze'ev is uncharacteristically unhelpful here, as I mentioned earlier (s. 5.1).
109 Aristotle, *On Rhetoric*, p. 155 (1386b).
110 W. Stephenson, 'St. Francis and Alcibiades: A Defence of Resentment', *Philosophia*, 1999, esp. p. 65.
111 F. Berenson, 'What is this Thing Called "Love"?', *Philosophy*, 1991, vol. 66, p. 74.

6 Teaching emotional virtue

1 Somewhat understandably, for a pragmatist such as John Dewey – the most famous, if also the most controversial, of twentieth-century philosophers of education – *any* philosophy that does not give top priority to education will be useless.
2 That the approach derived from Kohlberg's research can be described as pessimistic does not mean that Kohlberg himself was a pessimist on moral education; see further in s. 6.2.

3 C. Beck and C. Kosnik, 'Caring for the Emotions: Toward a More Balanced Schooling', in A. Neiman (ed.) *Philosophy of Education*, Urbana, Philosophy of Education Society, 1995, p. 161. Things may have changed slightly for the better since they wrote these words, but not much. Even the best conceived general works on moral education from recent years (and there are not too many of those around), such as M. S. Pritchard's book, *Reasonable Children: Moral Education and Moral Learning*, Kansas, University Press of Kansas, 1996, tend to leave the topic of emotion education more or less untouched.

4 For instance, S. Aðalbjarnardóttir and Á. Elíasdóttir's, *Samvera*, Reykjavík, Námsgagnastofnun, 1992, an excellent teaching text about 'Being Together' (being friends, playing together, working together), designed to stimulate pupils' socio-moral (including emotional) growth, is, understandably, best known in Iceland as it is written in Icelandic. N. Noddings's notion of 'caring' as the bedrock of moral education, *Caring: A Feminine Approach to Ethics and Moral Education*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1984, has a strong emotional dimension, and so does the ambitious, comprehensive, and apparently successful Child Development Project (CDP) for the development of prosocial character, see, for example, E. Schaps *et al.*, 'School as a Caring Community: A Key to Character Education', in A. Molnar (ed.) *The Construction of Children's Character. 96th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, II, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1997. However, neither of those has received the general attention that it should. Part of the problem is that work done within one academic discipline related to education (e.g. educational psychology) may be relatively unknown to followers of other such disciplines (e.g. pedagogy, philosophy of education, sociology of education).

5 This claim is not meant to exclude the possibility that the present generation of children might be less 'emotionally intelligent' in some respects than previous generations; see A. Ben-Ze'ev, *The Subtlety of Emotions*, Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press, 2000, p. 209.

6 An important milestone in this regard was the US Supreme Court's ban on classroom prayer in 1963, a ban which not only had religious, but also moral, implications.

7 F. Nietzsche, *Untimely Meditations*, trans. R. J. Hollingdale, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1983, p. 131. Incidentally, old-style 'character education' has enjoyed some sort of a revival in some places in the USA in recent years, and at least two states, Georgia and Alabama, have made such programmes mandatory.

8 Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, trans. T. Irwin, Indianapolis, Hackett., 1985, p. 53 (1110a).

9 Aristotle makes this point about the unjust and intemperate person; ibid., p. 68 (1114a).

10 Ibid., p. 39 (1105a).

11 Ibid., p. 35 (1104a).

12 For a further elaboration, see M. C. Nussbaum's classic, *The Fragility of Goodness*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1986.

13 Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, p. 70 (1114b).

14 Ibid., p. 40 (1105b).

15 For a fuller exposition of Aristotle on this point, see N. Sherman, 'The Role of Emotions in Aristotelian Virtue', in J. J. Cleary and W. Wians (eds) *Proceedings of the Boston Area Colloquium in Ancient Philosophy*, 1993, vol. 9, pp. 24ff; and also *Making a Necessity of Virtue: Aristotle and Kant on Virtue*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1997, pp. 78–9.

16 Cp. Ben-Ze'ev, *The Subtlety of Emotions*, p. 164.

17 Therefore, it is misleading to say, as J. M. Atherton does, that the 'virtues prepare children for the time when they can understand moral reasoning'; 'Virtues in Moral Education: Objections and Replies', *Educational Theory*, 1988, vol. 38, p. 304. Virtuous dispositions do not become redundant once a person's practical reason has developed. This is clear both in Aristotle and Mill (see. s. 2.3).

18 R. C. Solomon, 'Emotions and Choice', in C. Calhoun and R. C. Solomon (eds) *What Is an Emotion?*,*Classic Readings in Philosophical Psychology*, New York/Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1984, p. 307.

19 Interestingly, N. Sherman thinks that modern psychoanalysis provides tools for effecting the deep emotional changes that the Aristotelian model 'merely gestures toward': that it 'operationalizes' some of Aristotle's notions of emotion regulation; 'Taking Responsibility for Our Emotions', *Social Philosophy and Policy*, 1999, vol. 16, esp. pp. 320–1.

20 See further in T. C. Brickhouse, 'Roberts on Responsibility for Action and Character in the *Nicomachean Ethics*', *Ancient Philosophy*, 1991, vol. 11, esp. p. 147.

21 Sherman exposes and criticises this general pessimism; 'The Role of Emotions in Aristotelian Virtue', pp. 26–8.

22 Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, p. 292 (1179b).

23 Ibid., p. 4 (1095a).

24 See Aristotle, *On Rhetoric*, trans. G. A. Kennedy, New York/Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1991, pp. 163ff (1389a–b).

25 Sherman, *Making a Necessity of Virtue*, p. 79.

26 These are the types posited by the developmental psychologist Jerome Kagan; cited in D. Goleman, *Emotional Intelligence*, New York, Bantam Books, 1995, p. 246.

27 A. Bain, *The Emotions and the Will*, 4th edn, London, Longmans, Green, 1899, p. 449.

28 R. de Sousa, *The Rationality of Emotion*, Cambridge, Mass./London, MIT Press, 1987, p. 11.

29 S. Simmons and J. C. Simmons, *Measuring Emotional Intelligence: The Groundbreaking Guide to Applying the Principles of Emotional Intelligence*, Arlington, TX, Summit Publ. Group, 1997, pp. 11–12.

30 Goleman, *Emotional Intelligence*, p. xv.

31 J. D. Mayer and P. Salovey, 'Emotional Intelligence and the Construction and Regulation of Feelings', *Applied and Preventive Psychology*, 1995, vol. 4, p. 197.

32 P. Salovey and J. D. Mayer, 'Emotional Intelligence', *Imagination, Cognition, and Personality*, 1990, vol. 9. For a slightly more informative account, see Ben-Ze'ev's exposition; *The Subtlety of Emotions*, pp. 178–81.

33 See, for example, Goleman, *Emotional Intelligence*, p. xii.

34 H. Gardner, *Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences*, New York, Basic Books, 1983; *Multiple Intelligences: The Theory in Practice*, New York, Basic Books, 1993.

35 See, for example, Goleman's treatment of Gardner's theory; *Emotional Intelligence*, pp. 40ff.

36 Sherman, 'Taking Responsibility for Our Emotions', p. 295.

37 M. C. Nussbaum, 'Virtue Ethics: A Misleading Category?', *Journal of Ethics*, 1999, vol. 3, pp. 176, 180. At the same time, however, we must avoid the over-intellectualisation of emotion to which Nussbaum seems to be tempted. As has already been noted repeatedly in this book, although emotions are essentially rational, irrational occurrences of emotion are common, not least in the young.

For an extended discussion of 'malformed' emotions, see, for example, R. Wollheim, *On the Emotions*, New Haven/London, Yale University Press, 1999.

38 For some reason, the authors of the numerous articles about 'postmodern education', in which education journals, unhappily, abound of late, tend to turn a blind eye to those paradoxes.

39 L. Kohlberg, 'From Is to Ought: How to Commit the Naturalist Fallacy and Get Away with It', in T. Mischel (ed.) *Cognitive Development and Epistemology*, New York, Academic Press, 1971, p. 227.

40 Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, p. 208 (1155a). Recall here my earlier discussion in s. 2.1.

41 Cited in W. Damon, 'The Moral Development of Children', *Scientific American*, August 1999, pp. 58, 60. For a more detailed discussion, see ch. 2 of W. Damon, *The Moral Child: Nurturing Children's Natural Moral Growth*, New York, Free Press, 1988.

42 Damon, 'The Moral Development of Children', p. 62. Cp. the sad moral pessimism inherent in recent ('postmodern') misgivings about the existence of such a common ground; see, for example, various articles in A. Molnar (ed.), *The Construction of Children's Character. 96th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, II, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1997, s. 4: Critics of Character Education.

43 On the notion of 'emotional expertise', see Mayer and Salovey, 'Emotional Intelligence and the Construction and Regulation of Feelings', esp. pp. 205–6.

44 See, for example, M. Downey and A. V. Kelly, *Moral Education: Theory and Practice*, London, Harper & Row, 1978, p. 156; Beck and Kosnik, 'Caring for the Emotions', p. 165; D. Carr, *Educating the Virtues: An Essay on the Philosophical Psychology of Moral Development and Education*, London/New York, Routledge, 1991, pp. 254–5; D. Carr, 'After Kohlberg: Some Implications of an Ethics of Virtue for the Theory of Moral Education and Development', *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 1996, vol. 15, p. 367.

45 Cited in Pritchard, *Reasonable Children*, p. 90.

46 Guðrún Alda Harðardóttir (personal correspondence).

47 M. R. Lepper and D. Greene, 'Undermining Children's Intrinsic Interest with Extrinsic Rewards: A Test of the Overjustification Hypothesis', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1973, vol. 28. See also D. Putman, 'The Primacy of Virtue in Children's Moral Development', *Journal of Moral Education*, 1995, vol. 24.

48 Damon, 'The Moral Development of Children', p. 61.

49 J. S. Mill, *Utilitarianism, Liberty, Representative Government*, London, J. M. Dent, 1931, p. 9.

50 Much of the discussion to be found in L. Kohlberg's own work, *Essays on Moral Development*, I–III, New York, Harper Row, 1981, seems to me more nuanced than those bare results which typically have entered textbooks and teachers' manuals. However, since my exploration here is not primarily expository, we can make do with the more historically important Kohlberg, namely the 'Kohlberg' of textbook fame.

51 I borrow this term from Pritchard who defines himself as a 'hopist' on the moral reasonableness of children; *Reasonable Children*, p. ix.

52 Ch. 5 in G. B. Matthews, *The Philosophy of Childhood*, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1994, is particularly enlightening here.

53 See, for example, Carr, *Educating the Virtues*, p. 166.

54 For this criticism, see, for example, Pritchard, *Reasonable Children*, p. 129; Carr, *Educating the Virtues*, pp. 164ff; Carr, 'After Kohlberg'.

55 See D. Carr, 'Cross Questions and Crooked Answers: Contemporary Problems of Moral Education, in J. M. Halstead and T. H. McLaughlin (eds) *Education in Morality*, London, Routledge, 1999, p. 41 (footnote 12). These feminist misgivings were most famously expressed by C. Gilligan, *In a Different Voice*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1982.

56 After having taught at various levels of the educational system, from junior high school to university, my experience is that, in moral matters, 'what is sauce for the [female] goose is also sauce for the gander'. When it comes, for example, to sexual jealousy, research does not indicate that men are from Mars and women from Venus; cross-cultural studies show that men and women in different cultures report virtually identical levels of such jealousy; cited in D. M. Buss, *The Dangerous Passion: Why Jealousy Is as Necessary as Love and Sex*, New York, Free Press, 2000, pp. 49–50.

57 See, for example, Damon, 'The Moral Development of Children', pp. 58–59; Pritchard, *Reasonable Children*, pp. 127–8. For recent findings in developmental psychology about children's early development of emotional self-agency, see Sherman, 'Taking Responsibility for Our Emotions'.

58 Carr, *Educating the Virtues*, p. 8.

59 Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, p. 40 (1105b).

60 L. J. Walker, 'The Family Context for Moral Development', *Journal of Moral Education*, 1999, vol. 28, p. 264. I particularly recommend Walker's essay here, as indeed the entire September 1999 issue of *Journal of Moral Education*, to which Walker's piece serves as an introduction. This issue, devoted to moral education and family life, offers a welcome antidote to the typical scholarly lack of engagement with parental influence on children's early character formation.

61 Cp. on the one hand Sherman's Aristotelian account, 'The Role of Emotions in Aristotelian Virtue', p. 25, and on the other Goleman's treatment of contemporary research; *Emotional Intelligence*, p. 114.

62 See D. Baumrind, 'Current Patterns of Parental Authority', *Developmental Psychology Monograph*, 1971, vol. 4, and various subsequent papers that she has written.

63 See, for example, S. Aðalbjarnardóttir and L. G. Hafsteinsson, 'Tóbaksreykingar reykvískra ungmenna. Tengsl við uppeldishætti foreldra og reykingar foreldra og vina', *Uppeldi og menntun*, 1998, vol. 7.

64 Admittedly, permissive parents are caring and warm-hearted, and they do nurture their children's emotions much more than authoritarian or rejective-neglecting parents. However, the problem is that the clear and consistent rules are missing.

65 Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, p. 294 (1180a).

66 See ibid., p. 295 (1180b).

67 For the idea of the school as a 'value preserve', see M. Nisan, 'Personal Identity and Education for the Desirable', *Journal of Moral Education*, 1996, vol. 25.

68 Ben-Ze'ev, *The Subtlety of Emotions*, p. 240.

69 On the power of 'bootstrapping', see de Sousa, *The Rationality of Emotion*, p. 11.

70 Damon, *The Moral Child*, p. 152.

71 Carr, *Educating the Virtues*, p. 12. Cp. Noddings', *Caring*, with its emphasis on modelling as part of caring, for her the key to all moral education; students are stimulated to develop a caring attitude by the teacher's caring for them.

72 In Nietzsche, *Untimely Meditations*.

73 The obfuscating role of 'self-understanding' in some popular psychological theories and everyday discourse (where all kinds of personal and moral progress tends to be referred to as 'self-understanding') is another story.

74 For this example, see Ben-Ze'ev, *The Subtlety of Emotions*, p. 230.

75 R. C. Roberts, 'What an Emotion Is: A Sketch', *Philosophical Review*, 1988, vol. 97, p. 193.

76 Carr, *Educating the Virtues*, p. 9.

77 No one has emphasised this point as well and forcefully as Martha Nussbaum in various writings; recall, for example, her view about the story-dependent specification of our common humanity described in s. 2.1.

78 For a refreshing reminder of these old and simple truths, see C. H. Sommers, 'Teaching the Virtues', *The Public Interest*, 1993, vol. 111.

79 C. S. Brodie, 'Experiencing Emotions', *School Library Media Activities Monthly*, 1996, vol. 12, provides a helpful list of books arranged according to the different emotions highlighted in the respective stories, and she also suggests some clever book-extension ideas.

80 See, for example, Damon, 'The Moral Development of Children', p. 61.

81 The method of a 'sharing circle' is explained and exemplified in D. Schilling, *50 Activities for Teaching Emotional Intelligence. Level II: Middle School*, Spring Valley, CA, Innerchoice Publishing, 1996.

82 On the discursive foundation of self-respect, see P. C. Guin, 'A Normative Conception of Self-Esteem', *Bulletin of the International Council for Philosophical Inquiry with Children*, 1993, vol. 8. Notably, Guin refers to what I call 'self-respect' as 'normative self-esteem'; one more indication of the terminological confusion abroad in the literature, already brought home to us in s. 3.1.

83 M. Lipman, *Thinking in Education*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1991, p. 15.

84 M. Lipman, 'Using Philosophy to Educate Emotions', *Analytic Teaching*, 1995, vol. 15. Admittedly, the competition is not great.

85 Ibid., p. 4.

86 Recall here my mention, in s. 1.4, of the pedagogical value of prejudice.

87 Aristotle, *Politics*, trans. B. Jowett, in R. McKeon (ed.) *The Basic Works of Aristotle*, New York, Random House, 1941, pp. 1309–16 (1339a-1342b). For an interpretation, see, for example, Sherman, *Making a Necessity of Virtue*, pp. 90–1; G. Verbeke, *Moral Education in Aristotle*, Washington, DC, Catholic University of America Press, 1990, p. 20.

88 See C. Cottom, 'A Bold Experiment in Teaching Values', *Educational Leadership*, 1996, vol. 53.

89 Ibid., p. 55.

90 For a truly comprehensive view of moral education, both as a far as eclectic methods and diverse contents (not only moral knowledge and action, but also emotions) are concerned, see T. Lickona, 'Educating for Character: A Comprehensive Approach', in A. Molnar (ed.) *The Construction of Children's Character. 96th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, II, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1997.

91 The City Montessori School runs its own teacher-training programme.

92 For similar advice, see Goleman, *Emotional Intelligence*, p. 312.

93 J. Deigh, 'Cognitivism in the Theory of Emotions', *Ethics*, 1994, vol. 104, p. 851.

94 For a down-to-earth account of the practical demands of moral education, see E. L. Pincoffs, *Quandaries and Virtues: Against Reductivism in Ethics*, Kansas, University Press of Kansas, 1986, pp. 166ff.

95 Similar considerations, relating to *anger* as a potential virtue, can be found in J. Casey, *Pagan Virtue: An Essay in Ethics*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1990, p. 56.

96 D. Tombs, ' "Shame" as a Neglected Value in Schooling', *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 1995, vol. 29.

97 S. A. Bers and J. Rodin, 'Social-Comparison Jealousy: A Developmental and Motivational Study', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1984, vol. 47.

98 S. Frankel and I. Sherick, 'Observations on the Development of Normal Envy', *Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*, 1977, vol. 32, suggest such an interpretation from a psychological perspective.

99 Ben-Ze'ev, *The Subtlety of Emotions*, p. 324.

100 See J. Nubiola, 'Emancipación, Magnanimidad Y Mujeres', *Anuario Filosófico*, 1994, vol. 27.

101 Here Ben-Ze'ev for once agrees; *The Subtlety of Emotions*, p. 527.

102 Aristotle, *On Rhetoric*, pp. 163ff. (1389a–b).

103 For a parallel point concerning the elimination of irrational sibling jealousy, see Ben-Ze'ev, *The Subtlety of Emotions*, p. 300.

104 R. de Sousa, 'Emotions, Education and Time', *Metaphilosophy*, 1990, vol. 21, p. 446.

105 See, for example, Ben-Ze'ev, *The Subtlety of Emotions*, p. 231.

106 R. S. Dillon, 'Self-Respect: Moral, Emotional, Political', *Ethics*, 1997, vol. 107, p. 249.

107 On the *manner* (as distinct from personality *style* and teaching *method*) in which teachers display or fail to display the Aristotelian virtues (including *megalopsychia* and hence, arguably, pridefulness) in relations with their pupils, and how this may be observed and described, see C. Fallona, 'Manner in Teaching: A Study in Observing and Interpreting Teachers' Moral Values', *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 2000, vol. 16. Cp. D. T. Hansen, 'The Moral Importance of Teacher Style', *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 1993, vol. 25.

108 This exercise is loosely based on one in Schilling, *50 Activities for Teaching Emotional Intelligence*, p. 76.

109 For a fuller 'deconstruction' of innocence as a moral notion; see E. Wolgast, 'Innocence', *Philosophy*, 1993, vol. 68.

110 A. Breton, *Manifestoes of Surrealism*, trans. R. Seaver and H. R. Lane, Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press, 1969, p. 40.

111 J.-J. Rousseau, *Émile*, trans. B. Foxley, London, Dent, 1974.

112 See, for example, Verbeke, *Moral Education in Aristotle*, on Aristotle's anthropological background.

113 See also T. Smith, 'The Practice of Pride', *Social Philosophy and Policy*, 1998, vol. 15, p. 80.

114 See M. C. Nussbaum, 'Compassion: The Basic Social Emotion', *Social Philosophy and Policy*, 1996, vol. 13, for a further elaboration, where she draws on ideas from thinkers as distinct as Aristotle and Rousseau to press home her point about inter-human identification as the foundation of compassion.

115 F. Nietzsche, 'Schopenhauer as Educator' in *Untimely Meditations*, and *Human, All Too Human*, II, trans. R. J. Hollingdale, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1986.

116 See, for example, S. Aðalbjarnardóttir, 'Tracing the Developmental Processes of Teachers and Students: A Sociomoral Approach in School', *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 1999, vol. 43, p. 62.

117 Carr, *Educating the Virtues*, p. 10.

118 F. K. Oser, 'Morality in Professional Action: A Discourse Approach for Teaching', in F. K. Oser, A. Dick and J.-L. Patry (eds) *Effective and Responsible Teaching: The New Synthesis*, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass Publ., 1992.

119 See M.-F. Daniel, 'P4C in Preservice Teacher Education: Difficulties and Successes Encountered in Two Research Projects', *Analytic Teaching*, 1998, vol. 19.

120 For these and other no-nonsense suggestions about teacher training in morality, see Pincoffs, *Quandaries and Virtues*, pp. 172–174.

7 Concluding remarks

1 Recall my arguments against the authority of the *phronimos* in s. 2.2.
2 A. Ben-Ze'ev, *The Subtlety of Emotions*, Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press, 2000, p. 164.
3 Ibid., pp. 167–8.
4 M. Power and T. Dalgleish do so, for example, without much ado; *Cognition and Emotion: From Order to Disorder*, Hove, East Sussex, Psychology Press, 1997, pp. 38ff.
5 D. M. Buss, *The Dangerous Passion: Why Jealousy Is as Necessary as Love and Sex*, New York, Free Press, 2000, esp. pp. 1, 6, 21, 36, 162, and 225.
6 See, for example, Ben-Ze'ev, *The Subtlety of Emotions*, p. 533.
7 In rare cases a non-person; see s. 5.1.
8 Two caveats: First, I am speaking here from a moral point of view. A negative emotion may at times possess some other kind of value, witness for instance the aesthetic value of *Schadenfreude* in comedy. Interestingly, J. Portmann, *When Bad Things Happen to Other People*, New York/London, Routledge, 2000, suggests that even in comedy, there is indirect moral exploration at work as comedy allows us to try out morally ambiguous attitudes towards other people without really knowing where those attitudes will lead. Second, I am, of course, talking about emotions for which responsibility can be at least partly imputed to the agent; otherwise, the expression 'negative' will be out of place (see s. 1.4).
9 For the origin of this and other citations from Stephansson's poetry, see K. Kristjánsson, 'Stephan G. Stephansson: A Philosophical Poet, a Poetic Philosopher', *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, 1997, vol. 29. Cp. my defence of moral naturalism in s. 2.3 and my discussion of the moral 'myth of the given' in s. 6.4.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Aðalbjarnardóttir, S., 'Tracing the Developmental Processes of Teachers and Students: A Sociomoral Approach in School', *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 1999, vol. 43, pp. 57–79.

Aðalbjarnardóttir, S. and Elíasdóttir, Á., *Samvera*, Reykjavík, Námsgagnastofnun, 1992.

Aðalbjarnardóttir, S. and Hafsteinsson, L. G., 'Tóbaksreykingar reykvískra ungmenna. Tengsl við uppeldishætti foreldra og reykingar foreldra og vina', *Uppeldi og menntun*, 1998, vol. 7, pp. 83–98.

Adams, R. M., 'Involuntary Sins', *Philosophical Review*, 1985, vol. 94, pp. 3–31.

Ainslie, D. C., 'Scepticism About Persons in Book II of Hume's *Treatise*', *Journal of the History of Philosophy*, 1999, vol. 37, pp. 469–92.

Alston, W. P., 'Emotion and Feeling', in P. Edwards (ed.) *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, II, London/New York, Macmillan, 1967, pp. 479–86.

Andersson, T. M. and Miller, W. I., *Law and Literature in Medieval Iceland: Ljósvetninga Saga and Valla-Ljóts Saga*, Stanford, Stanford University Press, 1989.

Anscombe, G. E. M., 'Contraception and Chastity', *The Human World*, 1972, vol. 7, pp. 9–30.

—— 'Modern Moral Philosophy', in *The Collected Philosophical Papers of G. E. M. Anscombe*, III, *Ethics, Religion and Politics*, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1981, pp. 26–42.

—— 'On Brute Facts', in *The Collected Philosophical Papers of G. E. M. Anscombe*, III, *Ethics, Religion and Politics*, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1981, pp. 22–5.

Aquinas, St Thomas, *The Summa Theologica*, part II (9), trans. Fathers of the English Dominican Province, London, Burns Oates & Washbourne, 1912–1936.

Aristotle, *Parts of Animals* (*De Partibus Animalium*), trans. W. Ogle, in J. A. Smith and W. D. Ross (eds) *The Works of Aristotle*, V, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1912.

—— *De Anima*, trans. J. A. Smith, in W. D. Ross (ed.) *The Works of Aristotle*, III, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1931.

—— *Posterior Analytics*, trans. G. R. G. Mure, in R. McKeon (ed.) *The Basic Works of Aristotle*, New York, Random House, 1941.

—— *Politics*, trans. B. Jowett, in R. McKeon (ed.) *The Basic Works of Aristotle*, New York, Random House, 1941.

—— *Nicomachean Ethics*, trans. T. Irwin, Indianapolis, Hackett, 1985.

—— *On Rhetoric*, trans. G. A. Kennedy, New York/Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1991.

Arnold, M. B., *Emotion and Personality*, New York, Columbia University Press, 1960.

Atherton, J. M., 'Virtues in Moral Education: Objections and Replies', *Educational Theory*, 1988, vol. 38, pp. 299–310.

Averill, J. R., 'An Analysis of Psychophysiological Symbolism and Its Influence on Theories of Emotion', *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 1974, vol. 4, pp. 147–90.

—— 'Studies on Anger and Aggression: Implications for Theories of Emotion', *American Psychologist*, 1983, vol. 38, pp. 1145–60.

Baier, A., 'What Emotions Are About', in J. E. Tomberlin (ed.) *Philosophical Perspectives*, IV, *Action Theory and Philosophy of Mind*, Atascadero, CA, Ridgeview, 1990, pp. 1–29.

Bain, A., *Moral Science: A Compendium of Ethics*, New York, Appleton, 1869.

—— *The Emotions and the Will*, 4th edn, London, Longmans, Green, 1899.

Baumrind, D., 'Current Patterns of Parental Authority', *Developmental Psychology Monograph*, 1971, vol. 4, pp. 1–103

Beck, C. and Kosnik, C., 'Caring for the Emotions: Toward a More Balanced Schooling', in A. Neiman (ed.) *Philosophy of Education*, Urbana, Philosophy of Education Society, 1995, pp. 161–70.

Ben-Ze'ev, A., *The Subtlety of Emotions*, Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press, 2000.

Berenson, F., 'What is this Thing Called "Love"?', *Philosophy*, 1991, vol. 66, pp. 65–79.

Berger, F. R., *Happiness, Justice, and Freedom: The Moral and Political Philosophy of John Stuart Mill*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1984.

Bers, S. A. and Rodin, J., 'Social-Comparison Jealousy: A Developmental and Motivational Study', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1984, vol. 47, pp. 766–79.

Boxill, B. R., 'Self-Respect and Protest, in R. S. Dillon (ed.) *Dignity, Character, and Self-Respect*, London, Routledge, 1995, pp. 93–104.

Brennan, S., 'Recent Work in Feminist Ethics', *Ethics*, 1999, vol. 109, pp. 858–93.

Breslau, K., 'Silicon Valley's Latest Craze: Schadenfreude', *Newsweek*, 6 November 2000.

Breton, A., *Manifestoes of Surrealism*, trans. R. Seaver and H. R. Lane, Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press, 1969.

Brickhouse, T. C., 'Roberts on Responsibility for Action and Character in the *Nicomachean Ethics*', *Ancient Philosophy*, 1991, vol. 11, pp. 137–48.

Bringle, R. G., 'Psychosocial Aspects of Jealousy: A Transactional Model', in P. Salovey (ed.) *The Psychology of Jealousy and Envy*, New York/London, Guilford Press, 1991, pp. 103–31.

Brink, D. O., 'Mill's Deliberative Utilitarianism', *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 1992, vol. 21, pp. 67–104.

Brodie, C. S., 'Experiencing Emotions', *School Library Media Activities Monthly*, 1996, vol. 12, pp. 45–7.

Buss, D. M., *The Dangerous Passion: Why Jealousy Is as Necessary as Love and Sex*, New York, Free Press, 2000.

Calhoun, C., 'Cognitive Emotions?', in C. Calhoun and R. C. Solomon (eds) *What Is an Emotion? Classic Readings in Philosophical Psychology*, New York/Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1984, pp. 327–42.

Calhoun, C. and Solomon, R. C., 'Introduction', in C. Calhoun and R. C. Solomon (eds) *What Is an Emotion? Classic Readings in Philosophical Psychology*, New York/Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1984, pp. 3–40.

Carr, D., *Educating the Virtues: An Essay on the Philosophical Psychology of Moral Development and Education*, London/New York, Routledge, 1991.

—— 'After Kohlberg: Some Implications of an Ethics of Virtue for the Theory of Moral Education and Development', *Studies in Philosophy and Education*, 1996, vol. 15, pp. 353–70.

—— 'Cross Questions and Crooked Answers: Contemporary Problems of Moral Education', in J. M. Halstead and T. H. McLaughlin (eds) *Education in Morality*, London, Routledge, 1999, pp. 24–43.

Carter, I., *A Measure of Freedom*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1999.

Casey, J., *Pagan Virtue: An Essay in Ethics*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1990.

Cordner, C., 'Aristotelian Virtue and Its Limitations', *Philosophy*, 1994, vol. 69, pp. 291–316.

Cottom, C., 'A Bold Experiment in Teaching Values', *Educational Leadership*, 1996, vol. 53, pp. 54–8.

Crisp, R. and Slote, M., 'Introduction', in R. Crisp and M. Slote (eds) *Virtue Ethics*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1997, pp. 1–25.

Curzer, H. J., 'A Great Philosopher's Not So Great Account of Great Virtue: Aristotle's Treatment of "Greatness of Soul"', *Canadian Journal of Philosophy*, 1990, vol. 20, pp. 517–38.

—— 'Aristotle's Much Maligned *Megalopsychos*', *Australasian Journal of Philosophy*, 1991, vol. 69, pp. 131–51.

—— 'Aristotle's Account of the Virtue of Justice', *Apeiron*, 1995, vol. 28, pp. 207–38.

Damon, W., *The Moral Child: Nurturing Children's Natural Moral Growth*, New York, Free Press, 1988.

—— 'The Moral Development of Children', *Scientific American*, August 1999, pp. 57–62.

Daniel, M.-F., 'P4C in Preservice Teacher Education: Difficulties and Successes Encountered in Two Research Projects', *Analytic Teaching*, 1998, vol. 19, pp. 13–20.

D'Arms, J. and Jacobson, D., 'The Moralistic Fallacy: On the "Appropriateness" of Emotions', *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 2000, vol. 61, pp. 65–90.

Deigh, J., 'Cognitivism in the Theory of Emotions', *Ethics*, 1994, vol. 104, pp. 824–54.

Demos, R., 'Lying to Oneself', *Journal of Philosophy*, 1960, vol. 57, pp. 588–95.

Dillon, R. S., 'How to Lose Your Self-Respect', *American Philosophical Quarterly*, 1992, vol. 29, pp. 125–39.

—— 'Introduction', in R. S. Dillon (ed.) *Dignity, Character, and Self-Respect*, London, Routledge, 1995, pp. 1–49.

—— 'Self-Respect: Moral, Emotional, Political', *Ethics*, 1997, vol. 107, pp. 226–49.

Dissanayake, E., *Homo Aestheticus*, New York, Macmillan, 1992.

Downey, M. and Kelly, A. V., *Moral Education: Theory and Practice*, London, Harper & Row, 1978.

Fallona, C., 'Manner in Teaching: A Study in Observing and Interpreting Teachers' Moral Values', *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 2000, vol. 16, pp. 681–95.

Farrell, D. M., 'Jealousy', *Philosophical Review*, 1980, vol. 89, pp. 527–59.

—— 'Of Jealousy and Envy', in G. Graham and H. Lafollette (eds) *Person to Person*, Philadelphia, Temple University Press, 1989, pp. 245–68.

—— 'Jealousy and Desire', in R. E. Lamb (ed.) *Love Analyzed*, Boulder, Westview Press, 1997, pp. 165–88.

Foot, P., *Virtues and Vices and Other Essays in Moral Philosophy*, Oxford, Basil Blackwell, 1978.

—— 'Morality, Action and Outcome', in T. Honderich (ed.) *Morality and Objectivity: A Tribute to J. L. Mackie*, London, Routledge, 1985, pp. 23–38.

—— 'Utilitarianism and the Virtues', *Mind*, 1985, vol. 94, pp. 196–209.

Foster, H., 'Postmodernism: A Preface', in H. Foster (ed.) *Postmodern Culture*, London/Sidney, Pluto Press, 1985, pp. ix–xvi.

Frank, D. H., 'Anger as a Vice: A Maimonidean Critique of Aristotle's Ethics', *History of Philosophy Quarterly*, 1990, vol. 7, pp. 269–81.

Frankel, S. and Sherick, I., 'Observations on the Development of Normal Envy', *Psychoanalytic Study of the Child*, 1977, vol. 32, pp. 257–81.

Gardner, H., *Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences*, New York, Basic Books, 1983.

—— *Multiple Intelligences: The Theory in Practice*, New York, Basic Books, 1993.

Gibbard, A., *Wise Choices, Apt Feelings: A Theory of Normative Judgment*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1990.

Gilligan, C., *In a Different Voice*, Cambridge, Harvard University Press, 1982.

Goldie, P., *The Emotions: A Philosophical Exploration*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 2000.

Goleman, D., *Emotional Intelligence*, New York, Bantam Books, 1995.

Goodstein, L., ' "Declaration of a Global Ethic" Signed at Religious Parliament', *Washington Post*, 3 September 1993, p. 3.

Gordon, R., *The Structure of Emotions: Investigations in Cognitive Philosophy*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Graham, G., 'Liberalism: Metaphysical, Political, Historical', *Philosophical Papers*, 1993, vol. 22, pp. 97–122.

Griffiths, P. E., *What Emotions Really Are: The Problem of Psychological Categories*, Chicago/London, University of Chicago Press, 1997.

Guin, P. C., 'A Normative Conception of Self-Esteem', *Bulletin of the International Council for Philosophical Inquiry with Children*, 1993, vol. 8, pp. 10–11.

Gunnars, K., *Stephan G. Stephansson: Selected Prose and Poetry*, Red Deer, Red Deer College Press, 1988.

Gutmann, A., 'What's the Use of Going to School?', in A. Sen and B. Williams (eds) *Utilitarianism and Beyond*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1982, pp. 261–78.

Halwani, R., 'Virtue Ethics and Adultery', *Journal of Social Philosophy*, 1998, vol. 29, pp. 5–18.

Hansen, D. T., 'The Moral Importance of Teacher Style', *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 1993, vol. 25, pp. 397–421.

Hardie, W. F. R., ' "Magnanimity" in Aristotle's Ethics', *Phronesis*, 1978, vol. 23, pp. 63–79.

Hare, R. M., *Moral Thinking: Its Levels, Method, and Point*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1981.

Hare, S., 'The Paradox of Moral Humility', *American Philosophical Quarterly*, 1996, vol. 33, pp. 235–41.

Harvey, D., *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*, Oxford, Blackwell, 1990.

Hebdige, D., *Hiding in the Light: On Images and Things*, London, Routledge, 1988.

Held, D. t. D., '*Megalopsychia* in *Nicomachean Ethics* iv', *Ancient Philosophy*, 1993, vol. 13, pp. 95–110.

Herman, B., *The Practice of Moral Judgement*, Harvard, Harvard University Press, 1993.

Hill, T. E., Jr., 'Self-Respect Reconsidered', in R. S. Dillon (ed.) *Dignity, Character, and Self-Respect*, London, Routledge, 1995, pp. 117–24.

Hume, D., *Enquiries Concerning Human Understanding and Concerning the Principles of Morals*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1972.

—— *An Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1975.

—— *A Treatise of Human Nature*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1978.

Hursthouse, R., 'Arational Actions', *Journal of Philosophy*, 1991, vol. 88, pp. 57–68.

—— 'Virtue Theory and Abortion', *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 1991, vol. 20, pp. 223–46.

—— 'Applying Virtue Ethics', in R. Hursthouse, G. Lawrence and W. Quinn (eds) *Virtues and Reasons: Philippa Foot and Moral Theory*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1995, pp. 57–75.

—— 'Fallacies and Moral Dilemmas', *Argumentation*, 1995, vol. 9, pp. 617–32.

—— 'Normative Virtue Ethics', in R. Crisp (ed.) *How Should One Live? Essays on the Virtues*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1996, pp. 19–36.

—— 'Virtue Ethics and the Emotions', in D. Statman (ed.) *Virtue Ethics*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 1997, pp. 99–117.

—— *On Virtue Ethics*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1999.

James, W., *Principles of Psychology*, II, New York, Dover Publications, 1950.

Jameson, F., 'The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism', in *Postmodernism, or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*, London/New York, Verso, 1991, pp. 1–54.

Kagan, S., *The Limits of Morality*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1989.

Kapur, N. B., 'Why It Is Wrong to Be Always Guided by the Best: Consequentialism and Friendship', *Ethics*, 1991, vol. 101, pp. 483–504.

Karasawa, K., 'An Attributional Analysis of Reactions to Negative Emotions', *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 1995, vol. 21, pp. 456–67.

Kekes, J., 'Shame and Moral Progress', *Midwest Studies in Philosophy*, 1988, vol. 13, pp. 282–96.

Kenny, A., 'Philippa Foot on Double Effect', in R. Hursthouse, G. Lawrence and W. Quinn (eds) *Virtues and Reasons: Philippa Foot and Moral Theory*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1995, pp. 77–87.

Kohlberg, L., 'From Is to Ought: How to Commit the Naturalist Fallacy and Get Away with It', in T. Mischel (ed.) *Cognitive Development and Epistemology*, New York, Academic Press, 1971, pp. 151–235.

—— *Essays on Moral Development*, I–III, New York, Harper Row, 1981.

Kövecses, Z., *Emotion Concepts*, New York, Springer-Verlag, 1990.

Kovesi, J., *Moral Notions*, London, Routledge, 1971.

Kristjánsson, K., *Þroskakostir: Ritgerðir um siðferði og menntun*, Reykjavík, Rannsóknarstofnun í siðfræði, 1992.

—— *Social Freedom: The Responsibility View*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1996.

—— 'Why Persons Need Jealousy', *Personalist Forum*, 1996, vol. 12, pp. 163–81.

—— *Af tvennu illu: Ritgerðir um heimspeki*, Reykjavík, Heimskringla, 1997.

—— 'Stephan G. Stephansson: A Philosophical Poet, a Poetic Philosopher', *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, 1997, vol. 29, pp. 19–30.

—— 'Casual Sex Revisited', *Journal of Social Philosophy*, 1998, vol. 29, pp. 97–108.

—— 'Is There Something Wrong with "Free Action"?', *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 1998, vol. 10, pp. 259–73.

—— 'Reply to Pettit and Norman', *Journal of Theoretical Politics*, 1998, vol. 10, pp. 291–8.

—— 'Liberating Moral Traditions: Saga Morality and Aristotle's *Megalopsychia*', *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice*, 1998, vol. 1, pp. 397–422.

—— 'Self-Respect, *Megalopsychia*, and Moral Education', *Journal of Moral Education*, 1998, vol. 27, pp. 5–17.

—— 'Stórmennska', *Skírnir*, 1998, vol. 172, pp. 89–128.

—— 'A Prolegomena to "Emotional Intelligence" ', *Philosophy in the Contemporary World*, 1999, vol. 6, pp. 49–54.

—— 'Liberalism, Postmodernism, and the Schooling of the Emotions', *Journal of Thought*, 2000, vol. 35, pp. 57–74

—— 'Teaching Emotional Virtue: A Post-Kohlbergian Approach', *Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research*, 2000, vol. 44, pp. 405–22.

—— 'The Didactics of Emotion Education', *Analytic Teaching*, 2000, vol. 21, pp. 7–14.

—— 'Virtue Ethics and Emotional Conflict', *American Philosophical Quarterly*, 2000, vol. 37, pp. 193–207.

—— 'Utilitarian Naturalism and the Moral Justification of Emotions', *International Journal of Applied Philosophy*, 2000, vol. 14, pp. 43–58.

—— 'Pridefulness', *Journal of Value Inquiry*, 2001, vol. 35, pp. 165–78.

—— 'Some Remaining Problems in Cognitive Theories of Emotion', *International Philosophical Quarterly*, 2001, vol. 41, pp. 393–410.

Lange, C. G. and James, W., *The Emotions*, New York/London, Hafner, 1967.

Lepper, M. P. and Greene, D., 'Undermining Children's Intrinsic Interest with Extrinsic Rewards: A Test of the Overjustification Hypothesis', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1973, vol. 28, pp. 129–37.

Lickona, T., 'Educating for Character: A Comprehensive Approach', in A. Molnar (ed.) *The Construction of Children's Character. 96th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, II, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1997, pp. 45–62.

Lipman, M., *Thinking in Education*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1991.

—— 'Using Philosophy to Educate Emotions', *Analytic Teaching*, 1995, vol. 15, pp. 3–10.

Lloyd, R., *Closer and Closer Apart: Jealousy in Literature*, Ithaca\London, Cornell University Press, 1995.

MacIntyre, A., *After Virtue*, Notre Dame, IN, University of Notre Dame Press, 1981.

—— 'Plain Persons and Moral Philosophy: Rules, Virtues and Goods', *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly*, 1992, vol. 66, pp. 3–19.

Massey, S. J., 'Is Self-Respect a Moral or a Psychological Concept?', *Ethics*, 1983, vol. 93, pp. 246–61.

Matthews, G. B., *The Philosophy of Childhood*, Cambridge, Mass., Harvard University Press, 1994.

Mayer, J. D. and Salovey, P., 'Emotional Intelligence and the Construction and Regulation of Feelings', *Applied and Preventive Psychology*, 1995, vol. 4, pp. 197–208.

Mead, G. H., *Mind, Self and Society*, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1934.

Mill, J. S., *Utilitarianism, Liberty, Representative Government*, London, Dent, 1931.

Molnar, A. (ed.) *The Construction of Children's Character. 96th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, II, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1997.

Nagel, T., *Mortal Questions*, New York, Cambridge University Press, 1979.

Neu, J., 'Jealous Thoughts', in A. O. Rorty (ed.) *Explaining Emotions*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1980, pp. 425–63.

—— 'Pride and Identity', in R. C. Solomon (ed.) *Wicked Pleasures: Meditations on the Seven 'Deadly' Sins*, New York, Rowman & Littlefield, 1999, pp. 51–79.

Nietzsche, F., *Untimely Meditations*, trans. R. J. Hollingdale, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1983.

—— *Human, All Too Human*, II, trans. R. J. Hollingdale, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1986.

Nisan, M., 'Personal Identity and Education for the Desirable', *Journal of Moral Education*, 1996, vol. 25, pp. 75–83.

Noddings, N., *Caring: A Feminine Approach to Ethics and Moral Education*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1984.

Novitz, D., 'Forgiveness and Self-Respect', *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 1998, vol. 58, pp. 299–315.

Nozick, R., *Anarchy, State and Utopia*, New York, Basic Books, 1974.

Nubiola, J, 'Emancipación, Magnanimidad Y Mujeres', *Anuario Filosófico*, 1994, vol. 27, pp. 641–54.

Nussbaum, M. C., *The Fragility of Goodness*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1986.

—— 'Nature, Function, and Capability', *Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy*, 1988, suppl. vol. 1, pp. 145–84.

—— 'Recoiling from Reason' (Review of A. MacIntyre's *Whose Justice? Which Rationality*), *New York Review of Books*, 7 December 1989, 36–41.

—— 'Aristotelian Social Democracy', in R. B. Douglass, G. M. Mara and H. S. Richardson (eds) *Liberalism and the Good*, New York/London, Routledge, 1990, pp. 203–52.

—— 'Human Functioning and Social Justice: In Defence of Aristotelian Essentialism', *Political Theory*, 1992, vol. 20, pp. 202–46.

—— 'Non-Relative Virtues: An Aristotelian Approach', in M. C. Nussbaum and A. Sen (eds) *The Quality of Life*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1993, pp. 242–69.

—— 'The Gifford Lectures', given at the University of Edinburgh, 1993 (unpublished), forthcoming under the title *Upheavals of Thought: A Theory of the Emotions*, 2001 (unpublished draft).

—— *The Therapy of Desire: Theory and Practice in Hellenistic Ethics*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1994.

—— 'Aristotle on Human Nature and the Foundations of Ethics', in J. E. J. Altham and R. Harrison (eds) *World, Mind, and Ethics: Essays on the Ethical Philosophy of Bernard Williams*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1995.

—— 'Compassion: The Basic Social Emotion', *Social Philosophy and Policy*, 1996, vol. 13, pp. 27–58.

—— 'Political Animals: Luck, Love, and Dignity', *Metaphilosophy*, 1998, vol. 29, pp. 273–87.

—— 'Virtue Ethics: A Misleading Category?', *Journal of Ethics*, 1999, vol. 3, pp. 163–201.

—— 'Aristotle, Politics, and Human Capabilities: A Response to Antony, Arneson, Charlesworth, and Mulgan', *Ethics*, 2000, vol. 111, pp. 102–40.

Nuyen, A. T., 'Just Modesty', *American Philosophical Quarterly*, 1998, vol. 35, pp. 101–9.

Oakley, J., *Morality and the Emotions*, London/New York, Routledge, 1992.

—— 'Varieties of Virtue Ethics', *Ratio*, 1996, vol. 9, pp. 128–52.

Ortony, A., Core, G. L., and Collings, A., *The Cognitive Structure of Emotions*, New York, Cambridge University Press, 1988.

Oser, F. K., 'Morality in Professional Action: A Discourse Approach for Teaching', in F. K. Oser, A. Dick, and J.-L. Patry (eds) *Effective and Responsible Teaching: The New Synthesis*, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass, 1992, pp. 109–25.

Pálsson, G. and Durrenberger, E. P., 'To Dream of Fish: The Causes of Icelandic Skippers' Fishing Success', *Journal of Anthropological Research*, 1982, vol. 38, pp. 227–42.

—— 'Systems of Production and Social Discourse: The Skipper Effect Revisited', *American Anthropologist*, 1990, vol. 92, pp. 130–41.

Parrott, W. G., 'The Emotional Experiences of Envy and Jealousy', in P. Salovey (ed.) *The Psychology of Jealousy and Envy*, New York/London, Guilford Press, 1991, pp. 3–30.

—— and Smith, R. H., 'Distinguishing the Experiences of Envy and Jealousy', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1993, vol. 64, pp. 906–20.

Pincoffs, E. L., *Quandaries and Virtues: Against Reductivism in Ethics*, Kansas, University Press of Kansas, 1986.

Pinta, E. R., 'Pathological Tolerance', *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 1978, vol. 135, pp. 698–701.

Plato, *Symposium*, trans. M. Joyce, in E. Hamilton and H. Cairns (eds) *The Collected Dialogues*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1961.

Portmann, J., *When Bad Things Happen to Other People*, New York/London, Routledge, 2000.

Power, M. and Dalgleish, T., *Cognition and Emotion: From Order to Disorder*, Hove, East Sussex, Psychology Press, 1997.

Pritchard, M. S., *Reasonable Children: Moral Education and Moral Learning*, Kansas, University Press of Kansas, 1996.

Pugmire, D., 'Conflicting Emotions and the Indivisible Heart', *Philosophy*, 1996, vol. 71, pp. 27–40.

Putman, D., 'The Primacy of Virtue in Children's Moral Development', *Journal of Moral Education*, 1995, vol. 24, pp. 175–83.

Putnam, H., *Realism with a Human Face*, Cambridge, Mass./London, Harvard University Press, 1990.

Rawls, J., *A Theory of Justice*, London\New York, Oxford University Press, 1973.

—— 'Justice as Fairness: Political not Metaphysical', *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 1985, vol. 14, pp. 223–51.

Rey, G., 'Functionalism and the Emotions', in A. O. Rorty (ed.) *Explaining Emotions*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1980, pp. 163–95.

Ridge, M., 'Modesty as a Virtue', *American Philosophical Quarterly*, 2000, vol. 37, pp. 269–83.

Roberts, R. C., 'What an Emotion Is: A Sketch', *The Philosophical Review*, 1988, vol. 97, pp. 183–209.

—— 'Emotions as Judgments', *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 1999, vol. 59, pp. 93–8.

Rorty, A. O., 'Explaining Emotions', in A. O. Rorty (ed.) *Explaining Emotions*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1980, pp. 103–26.

—— 'Introduction', in A. O. Rorty (ed.) *Explaining Emotions*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1980, pp. 1–7.

—— ' "Pride Produces the Idea of Self": Hume on Moral Agency', *Australasian Journal of Philosophy*, 1990, vol. 68, pp. 255–69.

Rorty, R., 'Postmodernist Bourgeois Liberalism', *Journal of Philosophy*, 1983, vol. 80, pp. 583–9.

—— *Contingency, Irony, and Solidarity*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1989.

Rousseau, J.-J., *Émile*, trans. B. Foxley, London, Dent, 1974.

Ryle, G., *The Concept of Mind*, New York, Barnes & Noble, 1949.

Sachs, D., 'How to Distinguish Self-Respect from Self-Esteem', *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 1981, vol. 10, pp. 46–60.

Salovey, P. and Mayer, J. D., 'Emotional Intelligence', *Imagination, Cognition, and Personality*, 1990, vol. 9, pp. 185–211.

—— and Rodin J., 'The Differentiation of Social-Comparison Jealousy and Romantic Jealousy', *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 1986, vol. 50, pp. 1100–12.

Sandel, M., *Liberalism and the Limits of Justice*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1982.

Scarre, G., 'Utilitarianism and Self-Respect', *Utilitas*, 1992, vol. 4, pp. 27–42.

Schachter, S. and Singer, J., 'Cognitive, Social, and Physiological Determinants of Emotional State', in R. A. King (ed.) *Readings for an Introduction to Psychology*, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1966, pp. 246–67.

Schapiro, T., 'What Is a Child?', *Ethics*, 1999, vol. 109, pp. 715–38.

Schaps, E., Battistich, V. and Solomon, D., 'School as a Caring Community: A Key to Character Education', in A. Molnar (ed.) *The Construction of Children's Character. 96th Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education*, II, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1997, pp. 127–39.

Schilling, D., *50 Activities for Teaching Emotional Intelligence. Level II: Middle School*, Spring Valley, CA, Innerchoice Publishing, 1996.

Schueler, G. F., 'Why IS Modesty a Virtue', *Ethics*, 1999, vol. 109, pp. 835–41.

Sharpsteen, D. J., 'The Organization of Jealousy Knowledge: Romantic Jealousy as a Blended Emotion', in P. Salovey (ed.) *The Psychology of Jealousy and Envy*, New York/London, Guilford Press, 1991, pp. 31–51.

Sher, G., *Desert*, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1987.

—— *Beyond Neutrality: Perfectionism and Politics*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Sherman, N., 'Common Sense and Uncommon Virtue', *Midwest Studies in Philosophy*, 1988, vol. 13, pp. 97–114.

—— 'The Role of Emotions in Aristotelian Virtue', in J. J. Cleary and W. Wians (eds) *Proceedings of the Boston Area Colloquium in Ancient Philosophy*, 1993, vol. 9, pp. 1–33.

—— *Making a Necessity of Virtue: Aristotle and Kant on Virtue*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1997.

—— 'Taking Responsibility for Our Emotions', *Social Philosophy and Policy*, 1999, vol. 16, pp. 294–323.

Sichel, B. A., *Moral Education: Character, Community, and Ideals*, Philadelphia, Temple University Press, 1988.

Sidgwick, H., *Methods of Ethics*, New York, Dover Publications, 1966.

Simmons, S. and Simmons, J. C., *Measuring Emotional Intelligence: The Groundbreaking Guide to Applying the Principles of Emotional Intelligence*, Arlington, TX, Summit, 1997.

Slote, M., *From Morality to Virtue*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1992.

Smith, R. H., 'Envy and the Sense of Injustice', in P. Salovey (ed.) *The Psychology of Jealousy and Envy*, New York/London, Guilford Press, 1991, pp. 79–99.

Smith, T., 'The Practice of Pride', *Social Philosophy and Policy*, 1998, vol. 15, pp. 71–90.

Solomon, D., 'Internal Objections to Virtue Ethics', in D. Statman (ed.) *Virtue Ethics*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 1997, pp. 165–79.

Solomon, R. C., *The Passions*, Garden City, NY, Anchor/Doubleday, 1976.

—— 'Emotions and Choice', in A. O. Rorty (ed.) *Explaining Emotions*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1980, pp. 251–81.

—— 'Emotions and Choice', in C. Calhoun and R. C. Solomon (eds) *What Is an Emotion? Classic Readings in Philosophical Psychology*, New York/Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1984, pp. 305–26.

Sommers, C. H., 'Teaching the Virtues', *Public Interest*, 1993, vol. 111, pp. 3–13.

de Sousa, R., 'The Rationality of Emotions', in A. O. Rorty (ed.) *Explaining Emotions*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1980, pp. 127–51.

—— *The Rationality of Emotion*, Cambridge, Mass./London, MIT Press, 1987.

—— 'Emotions, Education and Time', *Metaphilosophy*, 1990, vol. 21, pp. 434–46.

Statman, D., 'Hard Cases and Moral Dilemmas', *Law and Philosophy*, 1996, vol. 15, pp. 117–146.

—— 'Introduction to Virtue Ethics', in D. Statman (ed.) *Virtue Ethics*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, 1997, pp. 1–41.

Stein, N. L. and Jewett, J. L., 'A Conceptual Analysis of the Meaning of Negative Emotions: Implications for a Theory of Development', in C. E. Izard and P. B. Read (eds) *Measuring Emotions in Infants and Children*, II, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1986, pp. 238–67.

Stephansson, S. G., *Selected Translations from Andvökur*, Edmonton, Stephan G. Stephansson Homestead Restoration Committee, 1982.

Stephenson, W., 'St Francis and Alcibiades: A Defence of Resentment', *Philosophia*, 1999, vol. 27, pp. 59–67.

Stocker, M. (with E. Hegeman), *Valuing Emotions*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Svavarsdóttir, S., 'Moral Cognitivism and Motivation', *Philosophical Review*, 1999, vol. 108, pp. 161–219.

Taylor, C., 'The Politics of Recognition' in A. Gutmann (ed.) *Multiculturalism: Examining the Politics of Recognition*, Princeton, NJ, Princeton University Press, 1994, pp. 25–73.

Taylor, G., 'Justifying the Emotions', *Mind*, 1975, vol. 84, pp. 390–402.

—— *Pride, Shame, and Guilt*, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1985.

—— 'Envy and Jealousy: Emotions and Vices', *Midwest Studies in Philosophy*, 1988, vol. 13, pp. 233–49.

Taylor, R., *Ethics, Faith, and Reason*, Englewood Cliffs, NJ, Prentice-Hall, 1985.

Telfer, E., 'Self-Respect', in R. S. Dillon (ed.) *Dignity, Character, and Self-Respect*, London, Routledge, 1995, pp. 108–16.

Tollefsen, C., 'Self-Assessing Emotions and Platonic Fear', *International Philosophical Quarterly*, 1997, vol. 37, pp. 305–18.

Tombs, D., '"Shame" as a Neglected Value in Schooling', *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, 1995, vol. 29, pp. 23–32.

Upton, H., 'On Applying Moral Theories', *Journal of Applied Philosophy*, 1993, vol. 10, pp. 189–199.

Van Sommers, P., *Jealousy*, London, Penguin, 1988.

Verbeke, G., *Moral Education in Aristotle*, Washington, DC, Catholic University of America Press, 1990.

Von Wright, G. H., *Varieties of Goodness*, London, Routledge, 1963.

Waismann, F., 'Verifiability', *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, 1945, suppl. vol. 19, pp. 119–31.

Walker, L. J., 'The Family Context for Moral Development', *Journal of Moral Education*, 1999, vol. 28, pp. 261–64.

Wallach, J. R., 'Contemporary Aristotelianism', *Political Theory*, 1992, vol. 20, pp. 613–41.

West, C., 'The New Cultural Politics of Difference', in S. During (ed.) *The Cultural Studies Reader*, London, Routledge, 1993, pp. 203–17.

White, G. L. and Mullen, P. E., *Jealousy: Theory, Research, and Clinical Strategies*, New York\London, Guilford Press, 1989.

White, S. A., *Sovereign Virtue: Aristotle on the Relation Between Happiness and Prosperity*, Stanford, CA, Stanford University Press, 1992.

Williams, B., *Moral Luck*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 1981.

—— *Shame and Necessity*, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1993.

Wolf, S., 'Happiness and Meaning: Two Aspects of the Good Life', *Social Philosophy and Policy*, 1997, vol. 14, pp. 207–25.

Wolgast, E., 'Innocence', *Philosophy*, 1993, vol. 68, pp. 297–307.

Wollheim, R., *On the Emotions*, New Haven\London, Yale University Press, 1999.

Wreen, M. J., 'Jealousy', *Noûs*, 1989, vol. 23, pp. 635–52.

INDEX