The Moral Powers

A Study of Human Nature

P.M.S. Hacker

WILEY Blackwell

The Moral Powers

The Moral Powers: A Study of Human Nature

P. M. S. Hacker

WILEY Blackwell

This edition first published 2021

Registered Offices
John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 111 River Street, Hoboken, NJ 07030, USA
John Wiley & Sons Ltd, The Atrium, Southern Gate, Chichester, West Sussex, PO19 8SQ, UK

Editorial Office
111 River Street, Hoboken, NJ 07030, USA

For details of our global editorial offices, customer services, and more information about Wiley products visit us at www.wiley.com.

Wiley also publishes its books in a variety of electronic formats and by print-on-demand. Some content that appears in standard print versions of this book may not be available in other formats.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Hacker, P. M. S. (Peter Michael Stephan), author.
Title: The moral powers : a study of human nature / P. M. S. Hacker.
Description: First edition. | Hoboken, NJ, USA : Wiley-Blackwell, 2020. | Includes bibliographical references and index.
Identifiers: LCCN 2020015635 (print) | LCCN 2020015636 (ebook) | ISBN 9781119657774 (paperback) | ISBN 9781119657804 (adobe pdf) | ISBN 9781119657798 (epub)
Subjects: LCSH: Philosophical anthropology.
Classification: LCC BD450 .H235555 2020 (print) | LCC BD450 (ebook) | DDC 128–dc23
LC record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2020015635
LC ebook record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2020015636

Cover design: Wiley

Set in 10.5/12.5pt Sabon by SPi Global, Pondicherry, India

10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

For

Max Bennett

Contents

Prolegomenon

1. Philosophical anthropology and the investigation of value

This volume is an essay in *philosophical anthropology*. Philosophical anthropology is not philosophy *of* anthropology. The absence of this term in anglophone philosophy is unfortunate, because we have to make do with 'philosophy of mind' on the one hand, and with 'ethics' or 'moral philosophy' on the other. But these are not coextensive with 'philosophical anthropology', which includes much more than philosophy of mind and does not incorporate the whole of moral philosophy. The expression *Philosophische Anthropologie* is common in the German philosophical tradition, as is patent in Kant's famous eponymous lectures. 'Philosophical anthropology', as I am using the expression, is the study of the conceptual framework in terms of which we think about, speak about, and investigate man (*Homo sapiens*) as a social and cultural animal.

It is a truism that human beings are extraordinarily complex creatures. But it is a truism worth bearing in mind when reflecting on the manifold concepts and multiple patterns of explanation that we invoke and employ in trying to describe and understand ourselves, and in trying to make ourselves intelligible to others. It is exceedingly improbable that any simple account or familiar 'ism' will render these transparent. The devil lies in the detail, and the gods in the overview. We are individual persons, each with a unique character and temperament, and each living an unrepeatable life. We differ widely in our thought and behaviour. Our relationships are often convoluted and indefinitely variable. Our ways of coping with stress are manifold. Our emotional lives are often opaque, not only to others, but also to ourselves. Self-knowledge and self-understanding of any depth are

relatively rare. Moreover, our proneness to self-deception is both powerful and widespread. Over the millennia of recorded history, we have evolved a rich and subtle language both to express our thoughts, feelings, and will, and to describe our psychological and epistemic attributes and our emotional relationships. This is not a theory of anything, but a vocabulary – a set of instruments, as it were, to express ourselves, to understand and explain ourselves and others, and to enable a reasonable degree of mutual predictability. This vocabulary is very large indeed – English is doubtlessly blessed in being the richest among Western languages in this respect. The complexity of the logical and grammatical relationships between the words and phrases, the manifold common figures of speech, metaphors, and analogies we deploy, form an extensive conceptual network that is difficult to describe correctly, let alone to survey. To attempt to do so is a task for philosophical anthropology. When successful, it benefits the human sciences (psychology, sociology, economics, cognitive neuroscience) and humane studies (literature, history, and the arts). For it lays bare the conceptual framework for our thought and talk about ourselves, and makes clear the bounds of sense that we so commonly transgress in our describing and theorizing, in our theoretical descriptions and diagnoses, and in our prescriptions for ameliorating the human condition, both in the small and in the large.

Philosophical anthropology, one might say, is the philosophical study of human beings. As such it lies at the intersection of metaphysics, philosophy of biology, philosophy of mind, epistemology, and moral philosophy. More than any other branch of philosophy, it is synthetic – drawing together a multitude of threads to weave a many-coloured tapestry of the nature of humanity, of human life, and of the ways we think about our lives and about ourselves.

Metaphysics, understood as super-physics investigating the objective necessary features of all possible worlds, or perhaps just of this, the only actual world, is a pseudo-science and no more than a dream of philosophy. In this domain, the task of philosophy is to curb our perennial temptation to indulge in metaphysical reasoning by showing where and why it transgresses the bounds of sense. Critical analytic philosophy aims to dissolve such dreams and show that what seemed treasure is merely fools' gold. But metaphysics may also be understood as an analytic investigation of the most general concepts and concept types in any conceptual scheme capable of describing experience and its objects in an objective spatio-temporal framework. Philosophical anthropology overlaps with metaphysics thus conceived. For it too is concerned with general categorial concepts, for example

with the concepts of substance, causation, agency, and power (potentialities, liabilities, and susceptibilities) – but only as they bear on the understanding of humanity and the concepts in terms of which we describe ourselves. For human beings are indeed substances (persistent individual things of a certain kind): they are agents that interfere in the course of events; they have a wide variety of causal powers and causal susceptibilities and liabilities, and numerous perceptual, cognitive, and cogitative abilities, abilities to act or refrain from acting, all of which present conceptual problems and generate numerous entanglements in the web of words.

Like philosophy of biology (properly practised), philosophical anthropology is concerned with teleology – goal directedness – in the biosphere in general and in human beings in particular. It is similarly concerned with the nature of teleological explanation of organs and their functions, for this bears directly on what is good for man: good health and the full exercise of native abilities. It is preoccupied with teleological explanation and understanding of the behaviour of animate creatures in general and of human beings in particular. For animals and humans alike act, as Aristotle put it, 'for the sake of an end', and a primary way of understanding what they do and why they do it is to explain their goals and to explain their behaviour and feelings (their frustrations and exasperations, their joys and satisfactions) by reference to the pursuit of their goals.

Unlike philosophy of biology, however, philosophical anthropology is also concerned with the nature of rationality and of reasonableness, subjects that lie at the heart of the study of man. Here philosophical anthropology provides conceptual analyses the understanding of which is fundamental for the social sciences and economics, and is pivotal for their constructive critique. The logical varieties of goodness: medical goodness, artefactual goodness, technical goodness, utile goodness, the beneficial, hedonic goodness, and moral goodness (see Chapter 1) undermine the idea of a simple relationship between preference and linear ordering. So too does the plurality of virtues. But the varieties of goodness and the multiplicity of virtues do not preclude rational choice. They exclude commensurability of value and the linear ordering of the plurality of values. But incommensurability does not imply the impossibility of preferences resting on good reasons. Conversely, the possibility of reasonable choice does not imply commensurability. The preferences and choices of individual human beings are personal, dynamic, dependent upon the exigencies of the situation, and unsystematic. These conceptual features constitute a radical challenge to received economic theory and social science.

Like philosophy of mind, philosophical anthropology is concerned with the investigation of the concept of a person, of the concepts of the mind and the body, and of the human faculties of sensation and perception, cognition and cogitation, memory and imagination, desire and will, the passions and the emotions. Unlike philosophy of mind, philosophical anthropology is not limited to the philosophical study of the nature of the human faculties, for it has to investigate the social nature of human beings and the manner in which that affects and moulds them. In particular, it has to investigate their most important defining characteristic: mastery of the social institution of a language and the way in which that determines what is possible for man. For a language is partly constitutive of a culture, and man, unlike all other animals, is a cultural being.

Mankind is distinctive, indeed unique, in the animal kingdom in valuing and pursuing so wide a range of things, and engaging in and enjoying such a wide range of activities. Human beings possess a very large range of skills in activities, and can accordingly aim to be, and are evaluated as being, excellent, good, or proficient. We are also unique in having a morality, possessing knowledge of good and evil, and having moral virtues such as compassion, honesty, and kindness. (The issue of whether animals can be said to have anything akin to a morality and moral virtues is examined in Appendix 1.) We are, above all, language-using, rule-following animals. Some of these rules are moral rules, partly constitutive of a morality, conformity with which is, other things being equal, partly constitutive of a morally good or admirable person. We cultivate, value, and admire certain human character traits, some of which – the moral virtues – are similarly constitutive of being a morally good person.

The investigation of human values and norms, and of human virtues and vices, is a province of moral philosophy that it shares with philosophical anthropology. It is, of course, not the whole of moral philosophy, for the latter incorporates the study of ethical theories, prescriptive ethics, and casuistry – applied ethics. But no study of the nature of man could be complete without extensive investigation of the nature of human morality (or moralities), of the concept and limits of morality, of axiology and normativity, of virtues and vices. However, the philosophical anthropological approach differs from that of moral philosophy. It is not concerned with constructing systems of morals (such as consequentialist and deontological ethics). Its primary task is to clarify the framework within which the existence of morality is intelligible, and to shed light on its scope and limits. In particular, it is to render the social phenomenon of a morality

intelligible. (Here the enterprise is similar to David Hume's in his *Enquiry concerning the Principles of Morals*.) What is the phenomenon? How is it possible for such a phenomenon to exist? What is presupposed for its existence?

These are among the subjects that will be discussed in this book. It is the final volume in a tetralogy of books in philosophical anthropology. The first was *Human Nature: the Categorial Framework*, which provided the stage set. The second was *The Intellectual Powers: a Study of Human Nature*, which began the play with the presentation of the intellect and its courtiers. The third was *The Passions: a Study of Human Nature*, which introduced the drama of the passions and the emotions. This volume turns to the moral powers and the will, to good and evil, to pleasure and happiness, to what gives meaning to our lives, and to the place of death in our lives.

This tetralogy constitutes a *Summa Anthropologica* in as much as it presents a systematic categorial overview of our thought and talk of human nature, ranging from substance, power, and causation to good and evil and the meaning of life. A *sine qua non* of any philosophical investigation, according to Grice, is a synopsis of the relevant logico-linguistic grammar. It is surely unreasonable that each generation should have to amass afresh these grammatical norms of conceptual exclusion, implication, compatibility, and contextual presupposition, as well as tense and person anomalies and asymmetries. So I have attempted to provide a compendium of usage of the pertinent categories in philosophical anthropology to assist others in their travels through these landscapes.

Each of the previous volumes was designed, at the cost of a modest degree of repetition, to be self-contained and intelligible in its own right. This volume has the same goal, but since it does presuppose what has been achieved in the previous three volumes, the following section is an attempt to sketch out what I have taken for granted here – an attempt to provide as it were a sinopia – the underdrawing of a fresco. Everything adumbrated in the next section is argued for at length in one or other of the previous three books that constitute the fresco.

As in *The Passions*, I have in this volume made extensive use of quotations from fiction, drama, and poetry. For novelists, dramatists, and poets give concrete and vivid depictions of good and evil, of pleasure and happiness, and of the place of death in human life. Since the understanding of these themes is predominantly idiographic rather than nomothetic, such presentations anchor the intellect and imagination in the concrete character of human life.

2. The sinopia for a fresco[1]

We are animate, self-moving, relatively persistent, material substances – animals of the species *Homo sapiens* of the Hominidae family. So, like all other animals, we *are* bodies, consisting of matter of various kinds, variously classifiable, and composed of parts of various kinds, variously classifiable. Our organs, both internal and external, have functions essentially related to our health and characteristic activities.

Being bodies, we are space occupants, tracing a unique route through the world as we wend our way from birth to death. We speak of ourselves as 'having' or 'possessing' a body. It is not evident how a being that *is* a body can also *have* a body. But the body we have is not the same as the body we are. Or, to be more perspicuous, all talk of the body we have and of its features, of its being black or white, athletic or lithe, beautiful or dumpy, youthful or aged, is no more than talk of our *somatic characteristics*. If someone's body is painted blue all over (like the ancient Britons), then he is painted blue all over; if someone has a graceful body, then she is graceful; if someone has an unhealthy, fat body, then he is unhealthy and fat. *The body we have* is not a possession, but this definite description is a form of presentation of the various somatic characteristics that we wish to pick out from among the totality of our characteristics. The body one has is neither clever nor stupid, neither knowledgeable nor ignorant, neither cheerful nor miserable. These are not somatic features but rather psychological characteristics, not of the mind but of the living human being as a whole. Of course, when one dies, one leaves a body behind – but that is not the body one had (one's somatic characteristics) but the corpse that is left when one dies. (Note that when one dies one does not become a corpse: one ceases to exist. When we bury a corpse, we are not burying the person – who no longer exists – but their remains. Nor are we burying the body they inhabited, since people do not inhabit their bodies.)

We have perceptual powers, both passive and active, and powers of sensation, both passive and active. We sometimes take pleasure in

[1] Three quarters of the painted fresco itself is to be found in *Human Nature: the Categorial Framework* (Blackwell, Oxford, 2007; henceforth *HNCF*), *The Intellectual Powers: a Study of Human Nature* (Wiley-Blackwell, Oxford, 2013; henceforth *IP*), and *The Passions: a Study of Human Nature* (Wiley-Blackwell, Oxford, 2017; henceforth *TP*).

perceiving and feeling. At other times we may feel disgust and revulsion at what we perceive or feel, or shame at our perceiving or feeling it. We can build machines to perform perceptual tasks. However, they can be said to perceive (if at all) only in a secondary sense of the word – just as calculators can calculate, and computers compute, only in a secondary sense of the words. The robots we build may come up with the results of perceiving those things we build them to monitor, but they perceive them only in a secondary sense and feel neither pleasure nor revulsion at what they thus 'perceive', let alone shame at having 'perceived' it.

Our perceptual powers are cognitive faculties. By their voluntary exercise and through their non-voluntary cognitive receptivity in passively seeing what is evident to sight or passively hearing what is audible to the ear, we can acquire knowledge of our environment. We may achieve or attain knowledge as the upshot of our voluntary deliberately looking or searching, scrutinizing or examining, listening for and listening to. But we may also be *given* knowledge in recognizing or noticing something, and in awareness or consciousness of something or a feature of something in our perceptual field. Moreover, knowledge may dawn on us in realization. Receptive knowledge is non-voluntary: one can be ordered to look but not recognize, to voluntarily look but not voluntarily realize, to intentionally investigate but not intentionally become or be conscious of something, to look on purpose but not be aware of something on purpose.

Like developed animals and unlike plants, micro-organisms, and primitive creatures, we are conscious beings. Like most animals, we go through a diurnal cycle of wakefulness and sleep, and through injury, illness, or sedation we may lose consciousness and become unconscious. Following Norman Malcolm, these may be called 'forms of intransitive consciousness'.[2] The much cited question of what consciousness is *for*, if addressed to the phenomena of intransitive consciousness, is patently misconceived. The proper question is 'What is sleep for?' – and to that empirical question we have as yet no clear answer.

When conscious, we may enjoy or suffer various forms of transitive perceptual consciousness. We may become and then be conscious of the ticking of the clock in the background, of the smell of cooking wafting in from the kitchen, of Jack's embarrassment or Jill's amusement.

[2] Norman Malcolm, 'Consciousness and Causality', in D. M. Armstrong and Norman Malcolm, *Consciousness and Causality* (Blackwell, Oxford, 1984), pp. 1–101.

In such cases, our attention is *caught and held* by something within our perceptual field. Transitive perceptual consciousness is neither voluntary nor involuntary, but non-voluntary. One cannot intend to become or to be conscious of something, nor can one order another to be conscious of something – but only to pay attention to something perceptible. Transitive perceptual consciousness is at home with perceptibilia that lie on the periphery of our perceptual field. It is factive: one cannot be conscious of something that is not there or of what is not the case, and it involves reception of knowledge – what one is perceptually conscious of one knows to be so or to be there. Here too the questions 'What is consciousness for?' and 'What is the evolutionary warrant for consciousness?' are singularly inept. No animal could survive for long in the jungle or on the savanna without cognitive receptivity for peripheral perception. There are other forms of consciousness; they need not engage us now (see *IP*, ch. 1, for full elaboration of the varieties of consciousness).

We have cognitive powers. Our perceptual powers are sources of knowledge. They are cognitive faculties. But they are not infallible – one may mistakenly think that one perceives and hence that one knows things to be so. Being fallible, they are also sources of belief. For belief is the default when knowledge fails. One form belief may take is knowledge minus truth. It does not follow that knowledge is belief plus truth (*IP*, chs 5–6). By the active exercise of our perceptual powers, we may come to know how things are. But coming to know how things are is not the same as coming to know what things are true: knowledge does not 'aim (primarily) at truth' – at how things are said to be or might be said to be – but at reality.[3] Knowledge is not a state or mental state and knowing something is not a state of mind. To know something is akin to an ability – an ability to state what one knows, to answer relevant questions, to act or feel for the reason constituted by what one knows (namely that things are thus and so). Being ability-like, knowledge cannot in general exist only for a moment. A creature that can know things can also retain what it knows. Retention of knowledge is not storage (one cannot store abilities), and storage of knowledge (i.e. of what is known) is not retention. Our mnemonic powers consist of retention of

[3] Of course, strictly speaking, contrary to Dummett and his followers, knowledge does not aim at anything. What human beings primarily want to know is how things are. We want to know what is true when we are concerned with sayables, namely propositions, assertions, statements, announcements, declarations, and so forth, that have been expressed or made, or are envisaged as being expressed or made, all of which may be true or false.

those abilities constitutive of knowing what we know, not of storing what we know. What we know can, given our goals and projects, provide us with reasons for thinking, feeling, or acting.

We have cogitative powers: we can not only think (believe, hold) things to be so, we can also *think*, that is *reason*. To reason is to engage in reasoning. But reasoning is not an act or activity – it is to come to apprehend what is known or believed to be so *as a reason warranting* a conclusion. Things are as the conclusion states them as being *because* things are as the premises describe them. To reason is to come to apprehend a premise or array of premises as *justifying* the conclusion. The justifying relation between premises and conclusion may be deductive or evidential. If evidential, it may be inductive or non-inductive. Non-inductive reasoning may be from constitutive evidence – logical criteria – to empirical conclusion. It may also be from hearsay, established fact, or accepted principle.

Reasoning may be theoretical or practical. Sound theoretical reasoning is from premises known to be true to a conclusion consisting of a true judgement. Practical reasoning has been variously conceived. On some accounts, it is from assumptions that incorporate a goal, valuation or norm to intention or decision formation, or to action. On others, it is from such premises to judgements concerning how to act, what intention to form, what decision to make, or what act to perform. Only language-using creatures have full-blown cogitative powers. Only a being that has mastered a developed language can engage in *reasoning*. For only a language user can apprehend a premise or premises as *warranting* (or not warranting) a given conclusion – be the conclusion a judgement or an action. Only a language user can think this to be so *because* that is so. This 'because' is not causal.

It lies in the nature of reasons and of reasoning that a reason is characterized in terms of a degree of universality. If my needs provide me with a reason for acting, feeling, or thinking thus and so, then the needs of others provide them with reasons for doing likewise. This does not imply that if something is a reason for me it must also be a reason for others in like circumstances. Others will not have shared my peculiar history, they will not have my array of commitments, and they may not share my tastes, likings, and dislikings. Nevertheless, recognition of something as a reason for me requires acknowledgement that it *can* likewise be a reason for another person in similar circumstances, and if it isn't there must be some difference between us. So in learning that 'I need it' or 'I enjoy it' can be an explanatory or justifying reason for me to advance, one also learns that it *can be* an explanatory or justifying reason for another to advance.

Rationality, in one sense, is an ability to apprehend reasons and to engage in reasoning. Its absence is not irrationality but non-rationality. Only if one can be rational or reasonable can one be irrational or unreasonable. The intellect is the faculty of rationality. Only creatures with an intellect can be said to have a will, as opposed to mere appetites and wants. To have a will is to have the power to deliberate, form intentions and plans, make decisions, and choose reasoned goals by the use of the intellect. Creatures that have powers of thought and will can be said to have a mind. To have a mind is no more to own or possess something than to have a body. As Wittgenstein did not say, the mind is not a something but it is not a nothing either (cf. *Philosophical Investigations*, §304). A creature that has a mind is a creature with abilities of rational thought and will.[4] All idioms of mind, such as 'having something in mind or at the back of one's mind', 'calling something to mind', 'making up or changing one's mind', and so forth, can be paraphrased into descriptions of the exercise of powers of intellect and will. The idioms of mind cluster around the exercise of powers of thought, reasoning, and deliberation, and the formation of intentions and decisions, of attention and concentration, of memory and recollection, and of opinion. The mind is no more identical with the brain than the horsepower of a car is identical with its engine, or the purchasing power of a banknote is identical with the banknote.

It follows that the venerable problem of the relation between my mind and my body, or between the mind a human being has and the body a human being has, disintegrates. For there is *no* relation between the body one has (i.e. one's somatic characteristics) and one's intellectual powers (e.g. one's powers to know, think, believe, deliberate, plan, form intentions, understand, perceive[5]). Of course, one may be proud of one's figure, and one's physical weakness may make one

[4] This is to revert to the Aristotelian conception of the mind (the rational *psuchē*) and to reject the Cartesian conception of the mind as identified with the contents of consciousness (Cartesian thoughts, or *cogitationes*). The reasons for this are spelled out in *HNCF*, ch. 8.

[5] With us, but not with animals lacking a language, perception is a quasi-intellectual power. A dog perceives a cat in the tree; we perceive that a cat is in the tree. The dog knows a cat is in the tree: it can see it, and is barking at it. We know that a cat is in the tree, and hence that it is true that there is a cat in the tree and that the proposition that a cat is in the tree is true. We can deliberate on what we know, and invoke it in our reasoning. We can bear it in mind without taking action, and call it to mind subsequently ('the cat was in the tree'); a dog can do none of these. As Aquinas observed, animals have sense faculties and a *vis estimativa* (or instinct), but lack what we have, namely a *vis cogitativa* (*Sententia libri De anima*, II.13.221). For elaboration, see *IP*, 393–7, and Appendix 1.

depressed – but these statements do not describe relationships between one's mind and one's body.

Like all substances, we undergo changes, which may be internal, external, or both. Internally caused changes may be intrinsic (due to our natural species constitution) or contingent (due to our individual genetic constitution or to happenstance). Externally caused change is brought about by things acting on us. Like all living substances, we undergo growth, maturation, and decline in the course of a natural cycle from inception of life until death and dissolution. The concepts of neonate, child, youth, adult, middle-aged, old man or woman are phase-sortal concepts indicative thereof. Death is the termination of existence – a dead human being is no more a human being than a fake five pound note is a five pound note. A dead human being is a corpse. It is a question of some interest what living beings leave corpses on death (*HNCF*, 9.4). A copse of dead trees is not a copse of corpses of trees. The carcass of a slaughtered cow is not the corpse of a cow.

Like all substances, we have causal powers: we can *act on* things, thereby bringing about or preventing change in the world. But we not only act on things: we also act, take action, and engage in activities. To act or to take action presupposes the ability to do or to refrain from doing what one does. In the absence of such a two-way ability, there is no act but at most a so-called reflex action. But a reflex action is not an agential action at all. To act or take action presupposes not only a two-way ability but also an opportunity. (One-way powers require only an occasion, the occurrence of which triggers the power; but an opportunity does not trigger the two-way powers of sentient beings – whether they act or not depends upon their goals and decisions.) Opportunities are agent relative in so far as what counts as an opportunity for an agent to act depends upon the agent's skills. So what is an opportunity for the highly skilful is not one for the beginner. Skills are refinements of abilities through emulation, practice, training, and being taught. Being uniquely dextrous, we are not only thinkers and doers but also makers. Although apes, sea otters, and Corvidae make use of objects as tools or even fashion passing tools, few in their natural state keep tools for future use, or hone and improve them, and none of them designs new tools or makes tools for the making of tools. This 'technical' aspect of human powers (*techne* refers to what used to be called the 'mysteries' of an art or craft) was central to Marxist thought in the nineteenth century and to Heideggerian thought in the twentieth.

Like all living things, we have needs. Absolute needs are independent of our contingent goals, and their satisfaction is a condition of health and normal functioning. Relative needs are dependent on

exigencies of our goals and wants. We have socially minimal needs, dependent on the received conception of the basic requirements of a tolerable social life. Socially minimal needs are historically conditioned. Our organs and faculties too have needs: exigencies of their normal functioning and exercise, the satisfaction of which will keep or make them well; or exigencies of their improvement, the satisfaction of which will make them better.

Like other animals we have appetites, both natural and acquired (addictions). Appetites are felt desires. So too are urges and cravings. We are subject to attraction and aversion, hence have likings and dislikings. So we have preferences, want certain things and are averse or indifferent to others, and choose from among the things we like to consume, to have, to do, or to enjoy. So we have inclinations. We have and pursue goals. So we have purposes, and do things on purpose. Our behaviour is commonly explained teleologically – by reference to that *for the sake of which* we do what we do. Teleological explanations of human acts, actions, and activities are compatible with causal explanations of muscular contractions, but they are not themselves causal. They answer the question 'Why?' by reference to reasons and motives, or by reference to chosen goals and intrinsically valuable activities, and by reference to abstract values such as truth or justice.

Because we are language users and possess cogitative powers of reasoning, we can take things to be reasons for us to think, feel, and do things. Reasons may be good, strong, or powerful as well as poor, weak, or bad. In deliberation we decide, prior to acting, which reason is, or which reasons are, decisive. In embracing a reason as decisive, we endorse the action it supports. In taking our action as done for a given reason, subsequent to acting, we make ourselves *answerable* for what we have done, thus conceived. For we then can answer the question 'Why?' by giving our reason. So, other things being equal, we are *responsible* for what we do or fail to do.

Unlike non-language-using animals, we have a *will*: the power to form *rational* or *reasonable* (as well as *irrational* or *unreasonable*) desires and wants in advance of action, on the basis of reasons that warrant or seem to us to warrant adopting a given goal, and hence provide or seem to provide reasons for wanting to pursue it, attain it, possess it, or engage in doing it. So we have the power to articulate our reasons for acting, thinking, and feeling, and to consider reasons pro and con. On that basis, we can come to a decision in advance of action. Everything that is reasonable is rational, but not everything rational is reasonable: the deliberations of 'rational economic man' are rational

but not reasonable. We can form intentions, plans, and projects on the basis of reasons, and harbour them for future action (*HNCF*, ch. 7).

Like other animals, we are subject to the passions (*TP*, ch. 1). Among the passions are the emotions. Emotions may have causes and reasons. Our reasons for our emotions are what we take to warrant our feelings. Reasons for emotions may be good, poor, bad, irrational, or unreasonable. Emotions may be irrational or unreasonable in their object, their rationale, their intensity, or their duration. Irrational or unreasonable emotions need curbing by reflection. This capacity for rational control of emotions presupposes reflective powers that can be possessed only by language users. Some of our emotions, in particular emotions of self-evaluation such as pride, guilt and shame, regret, embarrassment, and humiliation can be ascribed only to self-conscious language users.

I have harped here, as in previous volumes, on our mastery of a language as the main key to our nature as rational animals. Linnaeus, in the Age of Enlightenment, optimistically characterized us as *Homo sapiens* – but wisdom is a scarce commodity among mankind. We are above all *Homo loquens* – talking man. It has become fashionable in the last three decades to emphasize our continuity with the rest of the animal kingdom, in particular with the great apes. It is true that, in our animality, we share much with them. But most, if not all, that makes us distinct from them is attributable to our being language users. This includes our knowledge of good and evil and our susceptibility to guilt, shame, and remorse; our possession of an autobiography – a story of our life; our beliefs and myths about the history of our people; our technical and theoretical knowledge; our productive activities and the products that flow from them; our mathematical knowledge and employment of it in empirical judgements; our creative capacities in literature and the arts, and our aesthetic sense; our sense of humour and irony; and our knowledge of our mortality.

So far the sinopia of the fresco has been painted in *Human Nature: the Categorial Framework*, *The Intellectual Powers*, and *The Passions*. It should be evident that the painting is very large indeed, and that what I have sketched here only hints at the complexities and refinements that have been introduced on the huge, many-coloured fresco. One large array of items that is conspicuous by its absence thus far is the place of value in the scheme of things. In this volume, *The Moral Powers*, I fill in the axiological gaps.

Acknowledgements

Friends, colleagues, acquaintances, and ex-students have aided and encouraged me in writing this book. Correspondence with them was always helpful and illuminating. Conversations with them were a great delight, with much laughter and merriment. I am indebted to them all. They pulled up weeds, sowed seeds, and showed me how to train stubborn bushes to grow into pleasing shapes and to produce fruit.

I am grateful to Robert Cooter, David Ellis, Andrew English, Hanjo Glock, Edward Greenwood, Jonathan Hacker, Bernard Harrison, Lassi Jakola, Edward Kanterian, Anselm Mueller, Parashkev Nachev, Anthony O'Hear, Juan Pascual, Dennis Patterson, Amit Saad, Constantine Sandis, Harry Smit, Cosmin Vaduva, Christian Wenzel, and Aryeh Younger, all of whom read one or more, often many more, chapters of the book. Their comments, corrections, and advice were invariably helpful.

Edward Greenwood generously permitted me to print two of his philosophical poems that powerfully illustrated points I wished to make.

Hanoch Ben-Yami, Anthony Kenny, Iddo Landau, Hans Oberdiek, Herman Philipse, and Gabriele Taylor read the whole book as it was being written and went over each chapter with a fine tooth-comb. Their detailed and painstaking criticisms were invaluable, saving me from error again and again. Their sapient advice helped me find my way through the conceptual jungles and philosophical mountain ranges that I traversed. Their encouragement strengthened my will and raised my spirits. I am deeply indebted to them all and grateful for their friendship.

P.M.S.H.
Oxford
November 2019

The Valuers

This weary world's weighed down with woe,
Or so the pessimists will say,
And some so hate its being so
They cannot face another day.
Optimists bless the world's delight,
Savouring the sweetness of each hour,
Rejoicing in each blissful sight,
When each day opens like a flower.
For worthlessness is twinned with worth,
And hope can counterpoise despair,
If some can find their hell on earth,
Others can find their heaven there.
The optimist or pessimist
May be one self on different days,
The deepest moods do not persist:
The vagaries of mind amaze.
And change of time or change of place,
May do what lies beyond intent,
And with strange potency efface
Our misery or merriment.
Such is the state of humankind,
Sole valuers in a world of facts,
For they alone have powers of mind
To give them words to judge their acts.
When humankind is at an end,
No reckoning will keep a score,
Then light and dark will not contend,
And praise and blame will be no more.

Edward Greenwood

PART I

Of Good and Evil