

CONTENTS

PREFACE

xvii

I. THE SUPPOSED OBJECTIVITY OF MORAL JUDGMENTS 3

What is meant by the objectivity of moral judgments assumed by "normative" ethics, p. 3—The diversity of opinion with regard to the principles underlying the various normative systems, p. 3 *sq.*—The hedonistic principle supposed to be an analytical proposition, p. 4 *sq.*—J. S. Mill's arguments in favour of utilitarianism, pp. 6-8—H. Sidgwick's attempt to vindicate the validity of utilitarianism, pp. 8-15—His principle of "rational benevolence," supposed to rest on a fundamental moral intuition, pp. 9-15—His axioms of prudence and justice, p. 11 *sq.*—The general hedonistic principle also regarded by him as an object of intuition, p. 15—"Theological utilitarianism," pp. 15-20—Egoistic hedonism and its relation to universalistic hedonism or utilitarianism, pp. 17-20—Herbert Spencer's evolutionary utilitarianism, pp. 20-24—Leslie Stephen's evolutionary utilitarianism, p. 24 *sq.*—F. Paulsen's energism, pp. 26-28—F. H. Bradley's theory of self-realization, pp. 28-30—H. Rashdall's teleological theory, p. 30 *sq.*—L. T. Hobhouse's teleological theory, pp. 31-33—Unphilosophical intuitionism, p. 34.

II. THE SUPPOSED OBJECTIVITY OF MORAL JUDGMENTS (CONCLUDED) 35

The supposed existence in the human mind of some "faculty" that enables us to pronounce objectively valid moral judgments, pp. 35-41—Called "moral sense," pp. 35-37—Or "conscience," pp. 37-39—Or "practical" or "moral reason," or included under the general terms "reason" or "understanding," pp. 39-41—The presumed self-evidence of moral principles, pp. 41-44—The idea of moralists that moral judgments possess objective validity, adopted from the morality of common sense, p. 45 *sq.*—The common sense idea of the objective validity of moral judgments regarded as a proof of their really possessing such validity, p. 46 *sq.*—The general tendency to assign objectivity to our subjective experience, p. 48 *sq.*—The appearance of objectivity in moral judgments due to various circumstances, pp. 49-52—To the comparatively uniform nature of the moral consciousness, p. 50—To education, p. 50 *sq.*—To the authority of public opinion, custom, and law, p. 50 *sq.*—To the influence of some great teacher, p.

51—To the belief in an all-wise and all-powerful God, p. 51—To the internal authority assigned to the moral law, or conscience, p. 51 *sq.*—The supposed supremacy of the moral law, pp. 52-55—The theological argument in favour of the objectivity of moral judgments, pp. 55-57—The belief that ethical subjectivity is a dangerous doctrine, pp. 57-60—The supposed objectivity of moral judgments not only unproved, but impossible owing to their emotional origin, p. 60 *sq.*—The object of scientific ethics not to lay down rules for human conduct, but to study the moral consciousness as a fact, p. 61.

III. THE MORAL EMOTIONS

62

The moral emotions of two kinds: moral approval and moral disapproval or indignation, p. 62 *sq.*—The moral emotions retributive emotions, approval, like gratitude, forming a subspecies of retributive kindly emotion, and disapproval, like anger and revenge, forming a subspecies of resentment, p. 63—Professor McDougall's criticism of this scheme both in point of terminology and classification, p. 63 *sq.*—His criticism of the author's view of the relation between anger and revenge, pp. 64-68—Dr. Steinmetz's suggestion that revenge is essentially rooted in the feeling of power and superiority and originally undirected, pp. 65-67—Resentment a hostile attitude of mind towards a living being, or something taken for a living being, as a cause of pain, p. 68—Resentment, like reflex action, from which it has gradually developed, a means of protection for the animal, p. 68 *sq.*—The close connection between moral disapproval and non-moral resentment, pp. 69-71—The aggressiveness of moral disapproval modified under the influence of the altruistic sentiment, pp. 71-86—To take revenge on an enemy regarded as a duty in early ethics, p. 71 *sq.*—The rule of equivalence between the injury and the suffering inflicted in return for it, p. 72 *sq.*—The substitution of punishment for revenge, p. 73 *sq.*—The doctrine of forgiveness, condemning not every kind of resentment but non-moral resentment, not punishment but revenge, pp. 74-76—The aggressive character of moral disapproval modified not only by a more scrutinizing attitude towards resentment and retaliation, but also by condemnation of causing suffering merely for the sake of retribution, p. 76 *sq.*—The proper end of punishment considered to be, not retribution, but either to deter from crime, or to reform the criminal, or to repress crime by eliminating or secluding him, p. 77 *sq.*—The theorists who think it possible to make punishment independent of moral resentment victims of an illusion, pp. 78-80—Facts which lessen the gap between the theory of retribution and the other theories of punishment, pp. 80-83—The social usefulness of punishment, p. 84 *sq.*—The modification of the aggressive element in moral disapproval which is apparent in the attempt to narrow the channel of its activity by the rule that we should hate not the sinner but only the sin, p. 85 *sq.*—The instinctive de-

sire to inflict counter-pain (not necessarily physical) the most important characteristic of moral indignation, p. 85 *sq.*—Retributive kindly emotion a friendly attitude of mind towards a living being, or something taken for a living being, as a cause of pleasure, p. 86—Gratitude, p. 86 *sq.*—Retributive kindly emotion among the lower animals, p. 87 *sq.*—Its intrinsic object, p. 88—Moral approval a kind of retributive kindly emotion, p. 88.

IV. THE MORAL EMOTIONS (CONCLUDED)

89

Refutation of the opinion that moral emotions only arise after and in consequence of an intellectual process through which the moral quality of a certain course of conduct has been discerned, p. 89 *sq.*—At the same time moral judgments, being definite expressions of moral emotions, can help us to discover the true nature of these emotions, p. 90—Disinterestedness and impartiality, real or apparent, characteristics by which moral approval and disapproval are distinguished from other, non-moral, kinds of resentment or retributive kindly emotion, pp. 91-94—The analysis of the moral emotions attempted in this and the preceding chapter applies not only to such emotions as we feel on account of the conduct of others, but to such as we feel on account of our own conduct as well, p. 94 *sq.*—We may feel disinterested resentment, or retributive kindly emotion, on account of an injury inflicted, or a benefit conferred, upon another person with whose pain, or pleasure, we sympathize, and in whose welfare we take a kindly interest, pp. 95-105—Sympathetic feelings based on association, p. 96—Only the co-operation of the altruistic sentiment with sympathy induces us to take a kindly interest in the feelings of our neighbours, and tends to produce disinterested retributive emotions, p. 97 *sq.*—Sympathetic resentment a much more frequent emotion than sympathetic retributive kindness, p. 98—Sympathetic resentment among the lower animals, pp. 98-100—Maternal, paternal, and conjugal affection, pp. 100-103—Gregariousness, p. 103 *sq.*—The altruistic sentiment in all its forms characterized by the same tendency to feel kindness towards an individual who is a cause of pleasure, p. 104—Sympathetic resentment among savages, p. 104 *sq.*—Disinterested resentment not only felt in consequence of an injury inflicted upon another individual as a reaction against sympathetic pain, but also directly produced by the cognition of the signs of resentment, pp. 105-107—Disinterested resentment springing from disinterested antipathies or sentimental aversions, p. 107 *sq.*—Disinterested retributive kindly emotion produced by the signs of kindness, p. 108—Springing from disinterested likings, p. 108—Why disinterestedness and impartiality have become characteristics of that particular kind of retributive emotions that we call moral emotions, pp. 109-111—Customs not only public habits but also rules of conduct, p. 109—In early society the only moral rules, p. 109—The characteristics of moral disap-

proval to be sought for in its connection with custom, p. 110—Custom characterized by disinterestedness and at least apparent impartiality, p. 110 *sq.*—Custom a moral rule on account of the public disapproval called forth by its transgression, p. 111—As public disapproval is the prototype of moral disapproval, so public approval, expressed in public praise, is the prototype of moral approval, p. 111 *sq.*—Moral disapproval and approval have not always remained inseparably connected with the feelings of any special society, p. 112—Refutation of the opinion that the original form of the moral consciousness has been the individual conscience, p. 112 *sq.*

V. THE MORAL CONCEPTS

114

The theory of the emotional origin of moral judgments does not imply that such a judgment affirms the existence of a moral emotion in the mind of the person who utters it, p. 114—It implies that the qualities assigned to the subjects of moral judgments and expressed by moral concepts are generalizations of tendencies to feel either moral approval or disapproval, interpreted as dynamic tendencies in the phenomena which gave rise to the emotion, pp. 114-117—Our analysis of moral concepts to be concerned with such as are expressed in English terms, all of which have equivalents in other European languages, p. 118—Moral concepts among the lower races, p. 118—Language a rough generalizer, p. 118 *sq.*—Competition between the concept of "ought" or "duty" and that of "goodness," pp. 119-122—Analysis of "ought" and "duty," pp. 122-126—Of "bad" and "wrong," p. 126—Of "right," as an adjective, pp. 126-128—Of "right," as a substantive, p. 128 *sq.*—Of the relation between "rights" and "duties," p. 129 *sq.*—Of "injustice" and "justice," pp. 130-134—Of "good," pp. 134-137—Of the relation between "good" and "right," pp. 135-137—Of "virtue," pp. 137-139—Of the relation between "virtue" and "duty," p. 138 *sq.*—Of "merit," p. 139—Of the relation between "merit" and "duty," p. 140—The question of the "superobligatory," p. 140 *sq.*—The moral ideal, p. 141—Moral judgments which may be said to be true without possessing objective validity, p. 141 *sq.*—Objections raised to my theory of the emotional origin of the moral concepts, pp. 142-147—By Professor Sorley, p. 142—By Professor Moore, pp. 142-146—By Dr. Ross, pp. 144-146—By Dr. Rashdall, p. 146 *sq.*

VI. THE SUBJECTS OF MORAL JUDGMENTS

148

Analysis of the term "conduct," pp. 148-158—The meaning of the word "act," p. 148—There can be only one intention in one act, p. 148 *sq.*—The moral judgments pronounced on acts relate intrinsically to the intention and not to the event, p. 149—Deliberate wishes also objects of moral praise or blame, p. 147 *sq.*—The meaning of the word "motive," p. 150—The motive of an act may be an

intention, though only an intention belonging to another act, or a deliberate wish, and falls then within the sphere of moral valuation, p. 150—But even motives that are neither intentions or deliberate wishes may indirectly exercise influence on moral judgments, pp. 150-152—Moral judgments intrinsically passed not on intentions or deliberate wishes in the abstract, but on the persons who have them, p. 152—Many moral judgments, particularly those the predicates of which express no tendency to feel either approval or disapproval if the act is performed, take notice only of the intention of an act and say nothing about its motive, p. 152—There is in this respect a difference between acts called "right" and those called "wrong," p. 153 *sq.*—Forbearances morally equivalent to acts, p. 154—Distinction between forbearances and omissions, p. 154—Moral judgments refer not only to willing but to not-willing as well, not only to acts and forbearances, but to omissions, p. 154 *sq.*—Negligence, heedlessness, and rashness, p. 155—Moral blame concerned with not-willing only in so far as it is attributed to a defect of the "will," p. 155 *sq.*—The distinction between conscious omissions and forbearances, and between not-willing to refrain from doing and willing to do, may be of little or no significance from an ethical point of view, p. 156 *sq.*—The "known concomitants of acts," p. 157—Absence of volitions also gives rise to moral praise, p. 157 *sq.*—If by character is understood a person's will regarded as a continuous entity, the subject of a moral judgment is, strictly speaking, a person's character conceived as the cause of his conduct, p. 158 *sq.*—Moral judgments said to be passed on emotions, pp. 159-161—On opinions, p. 161 *sq.*—The light which early custom, law, and belief may throw on the subject of moral valuation, p. 162 *sq.*—Lack of discrimination between intentional and accidental injuries, pp. 163-168—Does not imply any difference in principle between the enlightened and unenlightened moral consciousness as regards the subject of moral valuation, pp. 165-168—Agents under intellectual disability: animals, little children, idiots, and madmen, pp. 168-170—Animals exposed to regular punishment, p. 169 *sq.*—Little notice taken of motives by early law and custom, p. 170 *sq.*—Why in early moral codes so-called negative commandments are much more prominent than positive commandments, p. 171—Moral approval and disapproval from the beginning felt with reference to persons on account of their conduct, their will regarded as a continuous entity, p. 171 *sq.*—Why moral judgments are passed on conduct and character, pp. 172-177—Not only moral emotions, but also non-moral retributive emotions when sufficiently deliberate, felt towards objects that are exactly similar in nature to those on which moral judgments are passed, pp. 172-176—Deliberate non-moral resentment felt only towards a living being or something which is taken for a living being, p. 173—Distinguishes between accidental and intentional injuries, p. 173—We feel hardly disposed to resent injuries inflicted upon us by animals, little chil-

dren, and madmen when we clearly realize their inability to judge of the nature of their acts, p. 174—Deliberate non-moral resentment influenced by the motives of acts, p. 174—What a person does in madness not an act committed by *him*, p. 174 *sq.*—When a hurt is attributed to lack of foresight, non-moral resentment *ceteris paribus* proportionate to the degree of carelessness laid to the offender's charge, p. 175—Non-moral resentment not indifferent to the character of the injurer, p. 175—Similar resemblances between the facts that give rise to gratitude and those which are objects of moral praise, p. 175 *sq.*—Futility of other attempts to solve the problem why moral judgments are passed on conduct and character, p. 176 *sq.*—A detailed inquiry into the moral valuation of the particular modes of conduct also shows its obvious connection with the retributive character of the moral emotions, p. 177—Distinction made in moral judgments between the original and the acquired character of a person, pp. 177-179—In the very strictest sense of the term, the proper subject of moral judgment is the innate character, p. 179—The opinion that responsibility, in the ordinary sense of the term, and moral judgments generally, are inconsistent with determinism, p. 179 *sq.*—As a matter of fact, however, moral emotions are felt by determinists and indeterminists alike, p. 180 *sq.*—Explanation of the fallacy at the bottom of the notion that moral valuation is inconsistent with determinism, p. 181 *sq.*—Causation confounded with compulsion, determinism confounded with fatalism, p. 181 *sq.*—The moral emotions no more concerned with the origin of the innate character than the aesthetic emotions are concerned with the origin of the beautiful object, p. 182.

VII. THE VARIABILITY OF MORAL JUDGMENTS

183

Whether the variety of moral judgments justifies the denial of objective validity depends in the first place upon the causes to which it is due, p. 183—Such denial not justified by cases where the diversity of moral opinion depends on insufficient knowledge of facts, or insufficient reflection, as regards the general subjective conditions of the modes of conduct to which the moral judgments refer, p. 183 *sq.*—Or where it depends upon different ideas relating to the objective nature of similar modes of conduct and their consequences, arising from different situations and external conditions of life, of which the customs of killing or abandoning old parents and of killing or exposure of new-born children serve as examples, pp. 184-187—Or where it originates in different measures of knowledge, based on experience of the consequences of conduct, or in different beliefs, pp. 187-196—The beliefs in supernatural forces or beings and in a future state have led to an extraordinary diversity of moral opinion, pp. 187-196—This is strikingly illustrated, for instance, by different attitudes towards human sacrifice, pp. 187-189—Towards suicide, pp. 189-192—Towards homosexual practices, pp. 192-196—On

the other hand there are differences of moral opinion that clash with that universality which is implied in the notion of the objectivity of moral judgments, pp. 197-219—This is the case with the gradual expansion of similar moral rules to larger and larger circles of men, an immediate cause of which has been a widening of the altruistic sentiment, pp. 197-208—The influence of religion on this process, p. 202 *sq.*—The influence of reason, pp. 203-207—The mistaken idea that the impartiality characteristic of all moral judgments required a universalization of the moral rules, which could only be accomplished by a process of reasoning, pp. 205-207—The variations of the altruistic sentiment in range and strength also responsible for the lack of unanimity as to the dictates of duty in cases where a person's own interests collide with those of his fellow-men, p. 208 *sq.*—The variety of moral opinion relating to men's conduct towards the lower animals, pp. 209-213—The notion of normative moralists that the changes of moral opinion are on a par with the discoveries made in science, pp. 213-215—Their failure to see that the changes in moral opinion and those in our theoretical knowledge are in a large measure due to fundamentally different causes, pp. 215-217—The fallacious argument that, with sufficient insight into facts, there would be no diversity of moral opinion if only the moral consciousness of all men were "sufficiently developed," p. 217 *sq.*—That moral judgments cannot possess that universality which is characteristic of truth also appears from the fact their predicates vary not only in quality but in quantity, p. 218—The quantitative differences of moral estimates due to the emotional origin of all moral concepts, p. 218 *sq.*

VIII. THE EMOTIONAL BACKGROUND OF NORMATIVE THEORIES

220

The general recognition of moralists that there is some connection between moral valuation and the production of pleasure or pain, due to the retributive character of the moral emotions, p. 220 *sq.*—Egoistic hedonism, pp. 221-223—Self-regarding duties and virtues, pp. 223-227—From the point of view of common sense utilitarianism has greatly exaggerated the *duty* of promoting one's own happiness, and underrated the *right* to do so when some other person's happiness is lessened thereby, p. 226 *sq.*—Utilitarianism in the first place due to the nature of the moral emotions, but its universalism not a mere expression of their disinterestedness and impartiality: it is closely connected with a corresponding expansion of the altruistic sentiment, pp. 227-229—Criticism to which utilitarianism has been subjected, p. 229—The commensurability of pleasures and pains assumed by it not found in the general moral valuation of conduct, p. 230 *sq.*—Utilitarianism insists on the necessity of acting according to general rules, but admits that there are emergencies in which they may be trans-

gressed, p. 231 *sq.*—Certain duties which have not an exclusively utilitarian foundation, pp. 232-258—Justice, p. 232—Veracity, which is required not merely because untruthfulness is apt to cause harm, but also because it is intrinsically antipathetic, pp. 232-235—Chastity, the moral valuation of which partly rests on a utilitarian basis, partly is influenced by specific religious ideas, and to a large extent springs from sentimental likes and dislikes, pp. 235-258—Sexual relations between men and women falling outside the recognized marriage institution, pp. 235-244—Adultery, pp. 244-246—Incest, pp. 246-250—Celibacy, pp. 251-257—Marriage regarded as a duty, pp. 251-253—Religious celibacy, pp. 253-256—Homosexual intercourse, p. 257—Sentimental preferences and aversions largely responsible for that divergence which exists between actual moral ideas and a consistently utilitarian code of morality, p. 258—When sufficiently discriminating, resentment is too much concerned with the will of the agent to be felt towards a person who obviously neither intends to offend any one nor is guilty of culpable oversight, p. 258—Utilitarianism not inseparably joined with psychological hedonism, which erroneously assumes that volition is always determined by pleasure or pain, p. 259 *sq.*—The distinction between the desire for pleasure and the desire for something pleasant emphasized by theories which have been included under names like energism, welfare theory, or eudemonism, p. 260 *sq.*—Since the fulfilment of a desire brings pleasure while the frustration of it brings pain, whatever the object of the desire may be, every ethical theory that regards any course of conduct which promotes the attainment of a certain desired end as good, and any course of conduct which obstructs it as bad, is so far in agreement with the view that moral judgments are ultimately based on emotional reactions against causes of pleasure or pain, p. 261—Moral intuitions nowadays generally referred to reason, or practical or moral reason, by which we apprehend moral truths immediately without the drawing of inferences, p. 261—Intuitionists' attempts to explain the relation between the intuitions and the emotions connected with them, p. 261 *sq.*—In the author's opinion the only reasonable explanation of the intimate connection between so-called intuitions and the presence of emotional tendencies is that the intuitions actually *are* these tendencies, formulated as judgments which are calculated to give moral values an objectivity that they do not in reality possess, p. 263.

IX. THE EMOTIONAL BACKGROUND OF NORMATIVE THEORIES (CONCLUDED)

264

Kant finds his ethics on conceptions of pure reason without any appeal to experience of any kind, p. 264—All moral laws must be valid with absolute necessity for all rational creatures, "in so far as they have a will, that is,

a power to determine their causality by the conception of rules"; and a law which must carry with it absolute necessity cannot be explained by experience but must be based on reason, pp. 264-266—Kant found the idea of the validity of the moral law, which he shared with common sense, in his moral consciousness in the form of a categorical imperative preserving the mysterious awfulness of the old "Thou shalt," as an echo from another world, p. 266 sq.—This emotional response to the notion of duty, together with some other factors, led him to the theory that there is no moral worth in any act that is not done simply for duty's sake, out of respect for the moral law, pp. 267-270—His view that all human inclinations are desire for pleasure, p. 268 sq.—His aversion to ethical hedonism and eudemonism, p. 270—His notion that the doing of a dutiful action necessarily involves a conscious resistance to inclination, p. 271—For Kant "duty" is an expression of admiration and reverence, of the emotion of moral approval aroused by obedience to duty, not merely by disapproval aroused by transgression; and we are particularly apt to bestow moral praise on a person who has done his duty in difficult circumstances when he had a strong interest in acting differently, p. 271 sq.—His notion of the sublimity of duty implies that he can assign no superiority to any other concept: good is what ought to be done, p. 272—His doctrine of moral imperatives in agreement with the fact, recognized by common sense, that duties are expressed in rules which command general obedience; but he refused to allow any exceptions to these rules, p. 272 sq.—The formulas of the categorical imperative, pp. 273-278—"Act only on that maxim whereby thou canst at the same time will that it should become a universal law," and, "Act so that the maxim of thy will can always at the same time hold good as a principle of universal legislation," pp. 273-277—The character of universality thus ascribed to the moral law an expression of the disinterestedness or impartiality of the moral emotions, p. 276 sq.—The formula, "So act as to treat humanity, whether in thine own person or in that of any other, in every case as an end withal, never as means only," an expression of a broad humanitarian feeling, p. 277 sq.—No command that every one should try to make himself happy, except as a means of escaping temptation to transgression of duty, p. 279 sq.—But a duty to promote the happiness of other men, p. 280—Differences between Kant's hedonistic doctrine of duties and the theory which generally goes under the name of utilitarianism, pp. 280-282—His attempt to establish the duty of beneficence by alleging that the egoistic maxim would contradict itself, p. 282—His duty of beneficence not really an inference from the categorical imperative, but a notion vaguely or distinctly found, though greatly varying in comprehensiveness, in the moral consciousness of all men, because it springs from emotions common to them all, p. 282 sq.—Kant's notion of the *summum bonum*, which is a combination of morality and happiness, the

latter conditioned by and proportioned to the former, pp. 283-285—An accurate correspondence between happiness and moral worth to be expected only if there is a moral and all-powerful Supreme Being who establishes such correspondence, p. 283—The combination of morality and happiness in the *summum bonum* said to be recognized *a priori*, as indispensably required by practical reason, but obviously the outcome of the moral emotion of retributive kindness towards a virtuous person worthy of happiness, p. 284 *sq.*—Kant's view that the sole object of punishment is retribution in accordance with the principle of equivalence both in quality and quantity (*jus talionis*), pp. 286-288—This doctrine, regarded by him as a dictate of practical reason, obviously an expression of the emotion of moral resentment, p. 288—The emotional background transparent throughout the ethics of the greatest of all rational moralists an important fact in favour of the main contentions in this book: that the moral consciousness is ultimately based on emotions, that the moral judgment lacks objective validity, that the moral values are not absolute but relative to the emotions they express, p. 289.