Maturity as a Guide to Morals

Inaugural-Dissertation
zur Erlangung des Doktorgrades
der Philosophie an der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität
München
vorgelegt von

Nils Hedstrand
aus
München

Digitaldruckzentrum, München 2007

Referent: Prof. Dr. Wilhelm Vossenkuhl

Korreferent: PD Dr. habil. Stephan Sellmaier

12.02.2007

Mature manhood: that means to have rediscovered
the seriousness one had as a child at play.
Nietzsche, *Beyond Good and Evil*

Contents

Chapter 4. Mature Judgement

Chapter 1

What is Maturity?

THE AIM OF THIS BOOK

The expressions 'mature' and 'immature' appear very frequently in our daily talk about morality: Not only do we say that a certain person, judgement, or action is 'good' or 'bad', we also say that he/she/it is 'mature' or 'immature'. Interestingly, no philosophical research has yet been done to clarify the concept of maturity and its relevance to morality, despite its actuality and importance in everyday moral thought.

Academic philosophy should always keep an affinity to everyday life. Philosophy should not be done by researchers only, and philosophical texts, including doctoral dissertations, should be understandable to anyone without any previous knowledge of a certain philosophical terminology. In his *Philosophy and Ordinary Language. The Bent and Genius of our Tongue*, Hanfling says:

> [I]f there is vagueness or inaccuracy in a philosopher's statements, then he can be asked to clarify his meaning in ordinary language; and we might become suspicious if he is unable or unwilling to do this.[1]

With the expression 'ordinary language' Hanfling means a language which lacks a special terminology. And he adds:

[1] Hanfling, *Philosophy and Ordinary Language* p. 2.

> When people – ordinary people or philosophers - ask questions about the extent of human knowledge, the reality of free will and the nature of happiness, we must assume that the meanings of these words are to be understood in accordance with their ordinary use. And even if these meanings are set aside in the course of a philosopher's discussions, they cannot be altogether disregarded. At least the philosopher should be able to tell us why the ordinary meanings were set aside, and how the answers that he proceeds to offer are related to the original questions with the original (ordinary) meanings.[2]

We will have more to say later in this introductory section about ordinary language.

In this work we will analyse the different meanings of the everyday expression of maturity and other related everyday expressions: morality, sympathy, autonomy, and mature judgement. As a name for the everyday meanings of expressions we will make use of the expression common sense.

'Common sense' can be used in different ways. It can mean a basic human reason or understanding, as in the German *gesunder Menschenverstand*, which is the way of reasoning of 'the plain man', unschooled in logical thinking and unbiased by scientific standpoints and by ideological concerns. Further, instead of such a basic human reason, it can mean most men's moral intuitions: Without having reflected on a certain matter, something can seem obviously morally right or wrong to one, like a certain distribution of goods, or the killing of an innocent person. Thirdly, it can mean the actual moral views currently held by most people in a community.

But when it comes to important moral questions like abortion, euthanasia, or capital punishment, most people tend to become confused and insecure, which shows that they are not really sure of their own moral views. And people's current views concerning morality are easily influenced by the way information is presented through newspapers, television, etc., and they tend to change very rapidly, and it is also uncertain whose moral views are to be considered as representing 'common sense' – are we to include the views of children, of people who are old and confused, of criminals, of political extremists and of religious fundamentalists, and of people suffering from various forms of mental illness? These objections are valid also concerning

[2] Hanfling, *Philosophy and Ordinary Language* pp. 4-5.

moral intuition: What 'we', i.e., people in general, find morally right or wrong at a first glance, before having considered the matter thoroughly, is a product not only of our upbringing but also of current influence by authorities. And the reasoning of the 'plain man', although being based on an immediate experience of everyday moral issues, tends to be burdened with prejudices and generally with unreflected dogmas inherited from parents and other authorites due to personal relations.

In this work we will use 'common sense' not in the meaning of a basic human reason, nor as moral intuition, nor as the actual views of most men, but instead in the meaning of the ways in which the expressions are used in daily speech, which determines their everyday meanings. The expressions relevant for the study are used in the way in which the author understands their use in everyday life today, and in such a way that no pretentious theoretical assumptions are connected to these uses prior to the analysis.

Usually we have no difficulties in using a certain expression correctly, i.e., in the right context, which means that we understand what the expression means in a practical sense. But when it comes to explaining what the expression means, i.e., how it is actually used, we easily become confused, which shows that although we are able to use the expression correctly, we are not aware of its exact meaning. This is not at all surprising, since our everyday expressions are vague, i.e., they have many different meanings, which can even be contradictory, since some of the different meanings of an expression may exclude other meanings. As we will see, 'maturity' is used both as the moral development at a certain stage of life, which means that there are different kinds of maturity, one for each stage, and as meaning mental adulthood as such, where maturity is just one. And we tend to use 'autonomy' as the capacity to care for oneself which makes it possible for one to fulfil one's social tasks, one's role in society, instead of just living from others, and this we consider a good thing, but we also use 'autonomy' in the meaning of being able to question one's social roles and the tasks which these roles imply, and this may mean questioning one's own responsibility and therewith one's social ties to other people: to family members, to friends, to working colleagues, etc., which may prove to be a danger to others.

A philosophical analysis of common sense in this sense may raise the question how such an enterprise relates to the philosophical tradition from the 20th Century which

is called 'ordinary language philosophy'. The term is mainly associated with the so-called Oxford School of philosophy which existed mainly during the 1950s and 1960s. We will use Hanfling's exposition of ordinary language philosophy from his *Philosophy and Ordinary Language*.

Hanfling uses the term in a wider sense than just as meaning the philosophical method used by Austin, Ryle, and others; he does not hesitate to include the later Wittgenstein, and he defends this kind of philosophy as being highly valid today, and he uses it himself to criticise theories put forward by Quine, Putnam, and Kripke.

Hanfling identifies ordinary language philosophy with what he calls 'linguistic philosophy', which is the investigation into 'what we say':[3]

> The typical method of linguistic philosophy is… to compare *the* use of it [an expression] with claims or assumptions that have been made.[4]

Concerning the question how the ordinary language philosopher can know what we actually say in ordinary life, Hanfling claims that our knowledge of words such as 'know', 'free', 'think', or 'cause' is participatory: We participate with others in the activity of using the words, and each of us is subject to pressure coming from the others to normalise his or her usage if he or she uses words abnormally. This means that language is constantly fine-tuned in interaction with others:

> Being himself a speaker of the language, the philosopher already knows what the word in question means; hence his position, unlike that of an empirical researcher, cannot be one of 'finding out'. The answer he seeks is one that – in a sense – he knows already. What he is trying to find out – or rather, to find – is a *formulation* of his knowledge: a statement of the conditions under which the word is used by those, including himself, who know how to use it.[5]

Hanfling speaks of making explicit a kind of knowledge that is constantly being enacted in practise. The philosopher's task is not to point out individual usages which differ from person to person or from one locality to another, but instead features of

[3] Hanfling, *Philosophy and Ordinary Language* p. 143.
[4] ibid. p. 60.
[5] ibid. pp. 57-58.

language that all participants can recognise. When the question is about *the meaning* of a word, and the word belongs to a language that the enquirer shares with his interlocutors, the enquirer is not in the position of finding out; the way to find out individual usages is empirical, for example by using questionnaires. Hanfling thereby distinguishes philosophical from empirical enquiry. The conceptual kind of enquiry is the province of philosophers, not of empirical linguists, he says.[6]

Still, today the use of the term 'ordinary language philosophy' is very strongly associated with the Oxford School. Nowadays there is no such school of philosophy, and this with good reason, since there are clear limits to the method of ordinary language philosophy.

Hanfling admits that ordinary language philosophy has but a limited and indirect application on the philosophy of science and of mathematics, in which considerations of the language of science and of mathematics take priority over that of ordinary life, although an enquiry into how these uses of language are related to those of ordinary life may still be of interest. Further, for evaluating arguments, a comparison of premise and conclusion is required rather than reflection on the meanings of words. This means that disputes concerning the validity of arguments cannot be solved by the method of ordinary language philosophy. And thirdly, ordinary language philosophy is not applicable on the area of meta-philosophy, i.e., philosophising about philosophy itself. The claim that the question about knowledge, for example, is essentially about language and to be tested by reference to what we say cannot itself be tested by reference to what we say, Hanfling says.[7]

Philosophy cannot make a halt at the everyday use of expressions and be content with just studying these uses. As we have noted, everyday language is often vague and therefore confusing. Hanfling points to one of the problems with our everyday semantic practice:

> The word 'rights' has recently become prominent in moral discourse, where it is often used freely in any situation in which there is, in the moral sense, right and wrong. Such expressions as 'animal rights', 'children's rights', and 'human rights' are sometimes used in this way. But to this usage it may be objected that the word has, or

[6] Hanfling, *Philosophy and Ordinary Language* pp. 58-59.
[7] ibid. pp. 5-6.

> originally had, a more specific meaning, involving certain kinds of moral obligations as distinct from others. (Typical examples are those in which a right is *bestowed*, by, say, a promise or a legal enactment.) If the word is applied more loosely, then, it is argued, moral perception may be distorted and inappropriate reasons given for what ought or ought not to be done. Now this is a contentious matter, which cannot be cleared up simply by asking people what they mean; and neither, of course, can it be settled by describing how the word is used in ordinary language, for the objector will claim that ordinary language – what has now become an ordinary use of 'rights' – is here at fault.[8]

Hanfling claims that in discussing this issue, we would certainly have to consider what one would say if an alleged right were challenged, comparing different utterances involving claims to rights. This may lead one to give names to different kinds of rights, which would mean introducing a terminology.

But it is doubtful whether this is enough for obtaining full clarity in moral deliberation. Certainly philosophers are right not only in introducing new terms for familiar uses of words, but also in re-defining familiar expressions. These new definitions may become generally accepted not only by other philosophers but with the time also by ordinary people, which would mean that our everyday language would increase in clarity.

This is a foundational work on the problem of maturity, building on no previous philosophical analyses dedicated especially to a study of this concept, and as such we will confine ourselves to a study of common sense. And according to the way we have chosen to use the expression common sense, this means that it is a study of the meanings of certain expressions in everyday language today. In addition we will analyse the semantic relations of these expressions due to their different meanings.

We will offer no new philosophical theory, and we will make no metaphysical claims. We will not claim that there 'is' maturity, and consequently we will not claim that there are mature human beings, nor that there 'is' such a thing as a mature judgement or a mature action. This work is no study of phenomenal objects and their

[8] Hanfling, *Philosophy and Ordinary Language* pp. 2-3.

causal connections, but of the logic of linguistic expressions, of their meanings and their semantic connections.

However this does not mean that this study can be said to continue the tradition of the Oxford School, and thus to be a work in ordinary language philosophy. Unlike Hanfling, we will not use the method of ordinary language philosophy to criticise any academic philosophers. Our hope is that what we have to say here may serve as a starting-point for further philosophical thought, which may well result in definitions which are more exact than the everyday uses of these expressions allow for, which means going beyond the method of ordinary language philosophy. This hope clashes with the intentions of ordinary language philosophy. In his essay *Ifs and Cans*, printed in *Philosophical Papers*, Austin writes:

> In the history of human inquiry, philosophy has the place of the initial central sun, seminal and tumultuous: from time to time it throws off some portion of itself to take station as a science, a planet, cool and well regulated, progressing steadily towards a distant final state. This happened long ago at the birth of mathematics, and again at the birth of physics: only in the last century we have witnessed the same process once again, slow and at the time almost imperceptible, in the birth of the science of mathematical logic, through the joint labours of philosophers and mathematicians. Is it not possible that the next century may see the birth, through the joint labours of philosophers, grammarians, and numerous other students of language, of a true and comprehensive *science of language*? Then we shall have rid ourselves of one more part of philosophy (there will still be plenty left) in the only way we ever can get rid of philosophy, by kicking it upstairs.[9]

Surely such a 'science of language', being empirical, would mean something quite different than offering exact definitions of everyday expressions.

For these reasons we will not use the term 'ordinary language' in this study, but instead 'everyday language' or 'daily language', although meaning the same as 'ordinary language' as the expression is used by Hanfling.

In this work we will analyse the ways in which the expressions 'morality', 'maturity', 'sympathy', 'autonomy', and 'mature judgement' are used in daily language, and we will concentrate on certain uses of these expressions which are of special in-

[9] Austin, *Philosophical Papers* p. 232.

terest to our project, namely to show the nature and moral relevance of the everyday expression of maturity. We will show that certain uses of 'maturity' are connected to certain uses of these other expressions, and that this points to the semantic connections between the everyday expressions of maturity and of morality. This will make it clear that a certain use of the expression 'sympathy' is connected to a certain use of the expression 'autonomy', which is connected to a certain use of 'mature judgement'. We will analyse the common sense expression of maturity in terms of an autonomy formed by sympathy, which can be interpreted as a morally relevant autonomy, one that gives a competence in judging and in acting well morally.

Referring to philosophical definitions of sympathy, autonomy, and moral judgement will help clarify how we use these expressions in daily language, and it will also help clarifying certain semantic connections between these everyday expressions. We will examine what the classics – Aristotle, Hume, and Kant - have to say, as well as some of the arguments made by modern authors. But since this is a work on common sense, we will refer to philosophical definitions only as far as this can help us in our task of clarifying common sense, and we will not argue against any philosophical positions.

The philosophical achievement of this work will be having clarified the meanings of the everyday expressions of morality, maturity, sympathy, autonomy, and mature judgement, and having pointed out certain semantic connections between these expressions, of which people may not be aware, although they are fully capable of using these expressions correctly in different contexts. Pointing out the different meanings of these everyday expressions and certain of their semantic connections may give a deeper understanding of the ways in which we use these expressions and of their importance to our daily moral practice. This may not only help clarifying the way we reason concerning morality: Not only offering new definitions of well-known expressions can change the way we reason and express ourselves concerning morality; such a project as that which we will undertake, of clarifying common sense, may also change our way of reasoning and expressing ourselves for the benefit of greater exactness, which would change the everyday meanings of these expressions.

Although it may be difficult to grasp the exact meaning of maturity in daily language, its use is not very problematic, and people clearly mean similar things when

talking about maturity. According to the way we use the expression, maturity is something which is good and valuable. It refers to some kind of norm to which we are expected to conform; one *ought* to be mature, and we blame someone for not being mature, and praise others for being mature. According to Coan in his *Hero, Artist, Sage, or Saint? A Survey of Views on what is Variously Called Mental Health, Normality, Maturity, Self-actualization, and Human Fulfillment*, the conception of maturity found in classical psychology – Freud, Jung, Erikson, Fromm, and others - is based on two traditions: the Judaeo-Christian love ethic, with the ideal of the humanitarian or altruist who is devoted to the welfare of others, and who is showing social concern and social competence, i.e., being able to relate successfully to others; and the individualistic tradition in the West from the Renaissance onward, with the ideal of the objective scientist or creative artist, characterised by intellectual competence, independence, emotional self-control, perseverance, and productivity.[10] We will show that these two traditions join in the common sense expression of maturity as an autonomy formed by sympathy.

We use the expressions 'morality', 'maturity', 'sympathy', and 'autonomy' in a social context. 'Morality' as the expression is used in daily language connotes different conceptions of how to live as to support other individuals both directly, in personal intercourse, and indirectly by supporting society as a whole for the sake of its members. 'Maturity' in the moral sphere in the everyday meaning of the word, as distinguished for example from aesthetic maturity, is a quality which gives the competence to live according to morality. 'Sympathy' means taking an interest in others and experiencing friendly feelings, which provides the agent with the means to a life according to morality. 'Autonomy' as influence and thus as authority over oneself gives one the capacity to form one's life in a social sphere, in a community of people, and an autonomy formed by sympathy gives one the capacity to form one's life according to morality.

The basic claim in this work will be that maturity can be described as an autonomy formed by sympathy. Autonomy we will describe as authority over one's self, where the self consists of the mind as well as of the body, and where authority over this self means executing an overriding influence over oneself, thus dominating oneself. This

[10] Coan, *Hero, Artist, Sage, or Saint?* p. 76.

authority over oneself is made possible as well as limited by sympathy in a certain meaning of the everyday expression of the word, namely what we will here choose to call a continuous, universal sympathy, directed towards all other men, consisting mainly of a certain mental attitude and of certain feelings, which allow for a morally relevant knowledge and which motivate one to use one's authority over oneself in the service of morality, in the ordinary sense of this expression. Thus an autonomy formed by a universal sympathy means dominating oneself with the aim of living according to morality, and this is what we mean by the expression maturity in everyday language. This allows for a competence in making mature judgements, which are good moral judgements which may lay claim to a certain objectivity, which means that they are trustworthy, that one has good reasons to assume them to be correct, and in acting accordingly. Good moral judgements are judgements which when acted on realise the aims of morality in the everyday sense, i.e., the good of others and the stability and thus permanence of society for the sake of all its members.

MORALITY AND MORAL JUDGEMENT

We will have to further clarify what we mean by morality in everyday language today. Aristotle's approach to morality in the *Nicomachean Ethics*, of declaring his project to be to find out what is best for man and how to obtain this for oneself, may make us modern readers confused. Aristotle's ethics contains two aspects which are both highly controversial today; first, his defence of self-love, and second, his claim that the ultimate aim of the good man's, the man with excellence of character (ηθικη αρετη), acting is his own self-fulfilment (ευδαιμονια). Aristotle states that everyone most of all wishes what is good for him- or herself, and since a man is his own best friend, he ought to love himself the most. Aristotle's morally good man loves himself because he loves his intellect (νους). For Aristotle, the intellect or human reason is the highest or best part of man, and for this reason it is man's true self. The good man gratifies his true self, which means that he wishes and does what is good for himself. In fact this means acting morally, since in doing so, the good man secures the highest good for himself, which is his self-fulfilment, which is social in character. Thus al-

though the good man supports others, the ultimate motivation for his moral acting is his own good. This points to the whole Aristotelian approach to morality: All men aim at what they believe to be the supreme good for themselves, but the opinions differ concerning the nature of this supreme good. The task of ethics is to clarify what is best for people themselves and how to obtain this. Morality ultimately is a means to one's own self-fulfilment.

Aristotle defends his position with the argument that good deeds are always rewarded in some way, so that one always has personal reasons to act in a way that supports others, and that therefore his good man is always useful to society:

> Hence those who are exceptionally devoted to the performance of fine actions receive the approval and commendation of all. And if everyone were striving for what is fine, and trying his hardest to do the finest deeds, then both the public welfare would be truly served, and each individual would enjoy the greatest of goods, since virtue [αρετη] is of this kind. So it is right for the good man to be self-loving, because then he will both be benefited himself by performing fine actions, and also help others.[11]

We should not forget that what is best, including most pleasant, for the Aristotelian good man is exercising his excellence of character, not obtaining external goods. Of course Aristotle's good man is not a direct egoist who is prepared to treat others badly to secure wealth and fame for himself. The direct egoist is the bad man, who in fact will harm not only others but eventually also himself by his acting.

Aristotle's morally good man certainly will be of great use for the city-state in supporting its citizens. So why be upset about the ultimate aim of his actions, since this aim motivates him to do good to others? Undoubtedly life in the city-state would be much more pleasant to most people if people would consciously try to follow Aristotle's advice, pleasant not only to the followers themselves but also to those who would not care for Aristotle and his theory. But still we are left with the feeling that the morally bad man, the direct egoist, is in possession of a kind of naïve honesty which the morally good man lacks, since he does not conceal his selfishness in the way the good man does. The fact that the good man is always ultimately working for his own highest good may make us feel uneasy, since we know that the ultimate rea-

[11] Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 1169a7-13.

son for his helping us is because it helps himself, and if something else would help him better, he would not help us. This points to the fact that the good man does not act out of *the right reasons*, which makes it obvious to us that the Aristotelian 'ethics', as it is usually called by philosophers today, is no ethics, no moral philosophy, in our modern sense of the word. Barnes says in his introduction to the *Nicomachean Ethics*:

> [T]he *Ethics* is not primarily or directly about moral philosophy: first, the chief end of the *Ethics* is to discover and delienate the life and character not of the morally good man, but of the man who is an expert human, successful and fulfilled *qua* man; and secondly, the most perfect human fulfilment is found to lie not in moral action at all but in intellectual contemplation – morality is, so to speak, a *pis aller*; we should follow it only insofar as we cannot travel the high road of thought.[12]

Human fulfilment is a possible conception of what might be called 'personal maturity': In this perspective, a mature man is a person who fulfils himself, and consequently all who fulfil themselves are mature. But can one's own personal fulfilment serve as the ultimate standard for *morality*? Somehow we who live today find such a claim dissatisfying: Moral maturity must consist in something more than just fulfilling oneself, although the process of fulfilling oneself may well prove to be – indirectly and incidentally - helpful to others. And it is by no means certain that self-fulfilment is so strongly connected to morality as Aristotle suggests: According to the way we use the expression 'self-fulfilment' today, it means procuring for oneself things like pleasure, feeling secure and well, cultivating one's interests, and experiencing that what one does is important to one and that it makes sense.

A different conception of morality, one which is not based on self-fulfilment, is presented by Habermas. We will here discuss his thoughts as they are put forward in his *Erläuterungen zur Diskursethik*.

Habermas defines morality as a defence system which compensates for a vulnerability which is built into the socio-cultural forms of life. Morality must secure both the individual's integrity (*Unantastbarkeit*) and the stability of the mutual relations between the members of society, since the persons can stabilise their vulnerable iden-

[12] Barnes, *Introduction* p. 40. In the *Politics* (1324a28) Aristotle says explicitly that a purely intellectual (θεωρετικος) life is devoid of all activity directed outwards.

tities only in co-operation with others. This demands respect for their dignity, i.e., equal respect and equal rights for all – Habermas also speaks of respect for their autonomy - and further that their intersubjective relations of mutual acceptance through which they preserve themselves as belonging to society are protected. This requires solidarity on the part of the individuals as members of a community, and this solidarity refers to the good of the other members, their weal and woe (*Wohlergehen*), and to the preservation of this form of life of intersubjective relations. Practically this requires the overcoming of one's egocentric perspective, and the acceptance of all of this solidarity. Both these aspects, the rights of the individual *and* the good of the community, are motivated by the vulnerability of persons. Men individuate themselves, become individuals, through their socialisation, and thus caring for the good of one's neighbour and caring for the good of the community (*das allgemeine Wohl*) are connected, and morality must secure both aspects. And Habermas claims that it is possible to respect everyone's interests without tearing apart the social bond which connects each person with all the others: Our moral intuitions inform us how we shall act for working against the extreme vulnerability of persons.[13]

According to the way we commonly use the expression today, morality means a system of views concerning how to behave as to support other individuals according to their needs and wishes, with the aim of securing mutual support for the members of a community. It is not as strongly oriented towards the vulnerability of persons as Habermas's ethics is. Morality today prescribes supporting others for their sake, and not, not even indirectly, for one's own sake. It concerns one's behaviour towards other people only, and thus it does not give any guidelines concerning self-support. The probable reason is that people tend to support themselves anyway, and so there is no need for any moral obligations to support oneself. Morality concerns one's treatment of oneself only in so far as this treatment may violate any direct responsibilities which one has for other people. Such responsibilities are dependent on promises and on human relationships, for example on parenthood. Thus we would not use the expression of morality in the case of a person ruining his own life, calling him 'immoral', with the exception of a case where the person has made a promise not to ruin his life, or when ruining his life makes it impossible for him to take care of his

[13] Habermas, *Erläuterungen zur Diskursethik* pp. 14-16, 70.

children or other close relatives, for whom he is thought to be responsible without having made any promises. The same holds true concerning self-mutilation or suicide. This means that one cannot act 'morally' or 'immorally' towards oneself. With such a conception of morality, the ultimate standard for moral maturity cannot be a self-related phenomenon like self-fulfilment or authenticity; it must be directly, not only indirectly, related to other people.

Thus, and contrary to Aristotle, 'morality', as we use the expression in everyday language, is exclusively concerned with one's behaviour towards others, either directly, or indirectly: directly for example in helping another person who is about to drown; indirectly by providing persons with the means to their own self-fulfilment and by removing obstacles to this aim. This means that whereas Aristotle would say that one shall be moral for the sake of fulfilling oneself, the way we use the expression morality today indicates that one shall be moral for the sake of supporting others.

Morality demands that we consider the good of all men when making a moral judgement. Primarily this means the persons directly affected, secondarily all present and even future members of society. Indirect support of all present and even future members of society, by providing others with the means to their own self-fulfilment and by removing obstacles to this aim, includes supporting institutions which are needed for the order and thus stability and therewith permanence of society. This means that similarly to Habermas, morality demands not only taking the persons involved in the actual situation into regard, but also the community of men, what is good for society as a whole. Long-term support of other individuals requires permanence and prosperity of society, and this requires taking the laws of the state and the customs of society into consideration when making a moral judgement. Promise-keeping and truth-telling, for example, may gain in importance when considering the preservation of society for the sake of its members. This implies that morality respects people's preferences as long as these do not clearly endanger the persons themselves or other persons or the whole of society.

But although morality, according to the way we use the expression in daily language, demands of us to act in favour of others, instead of acting in favour of ourselves, still it does not demand of us that we ruin or destroy our own lives in order to

assist others. No-one would call a man who refused to sacrifice his own life 'immoral'. Instead, morality demands of us only to fulfil certain minimal criteria of good citizenship in the everyday sense of the expression; of not harming others through physical or mental violence, of helping fellow citizens in need, and, as we have noted, of supporting the possibilities of self-fulfilment for all present and future members of society. Morality in the everyday sense of the word allows for taking care of oneself to a certain extent, to protect one's own life and to pursue one's own self-fulfilment to a certain extent, which means that morality allows for a certain prudence in the everyday sense, i.e., deliberating on and acting for one's own good. This means that although heroic actions, notably of self-sacrifice, are not forbidden by morality, they clearly are beyond what morality demands.

Whereas Aristotle does not distinguish between prudential and moral judgements, since Aristotelian prudence is an excellence of character, i.e., a moral quality, and since the ultimate aim of moral deliberation is to support oneself in the best possible way, the everyday meaning of 'moral judgement' today as meaning a particular moral judgement differs not only from what we commonly mean with a factual judgement, but also from what we mean with a prudential judgement. The factual judgement just states what is the case, whereas the prudential judgement says what is good for oneself, which is an evaluation, and what one should do to obtain this good, which is a normative statement; the particular moral judgement finally says what is good or bad for others, or what is right or wrong, either generally or in a specific situation, or which rights people have or do not have (an evaluation), and/or what ought or ought not to be done (a normative statement).

The moral judgement may but must not say who is to act. A good moral judgement tells one how to support other people, directly or indirectly, and what is good for a person is basically what keeps him alive and what makes his life worth living to himself, which is his own self-fulfilment. Of course this tends to vary between people depending on what they think is important to themselves, but in fact people tend to want much the same things; and we have already explained the everyday expression of self-fulfilment as being connected to pleasure, feeling secure and well, cultivating one's interests, and experiencing that what one does is important to one and that it makes sense. Morality aims at securing the possibilities for individual self-fulfilment,

in intercourse with others, making life worth living to everyone in society. We are not always ourselves the best judges of what keeps us alive, and we are not even always the best judges of what makes our lives worth living, since we may have forgotten or simply neglect considering what is important to us, while others may be aware of this and being prepared to support us with it, and when we receive it, we feel joyful, relieved, satisfied etc. If we do not react positively in any way at all, then this something does not make our lives worth living, although it may be something which most people enjoy. This means that although we may not ourselves know what makes our lives worth living, what makes our lives worth living is still dependent on what we like when we actually experience things. After having suffered a considerable brain damage through an accident, a person of 40 can take pleasure in playing with dolls, and although we may pity him or her, thinking that a person of his or her age ought to engage in more meaningful activities which would give him or her a deeper sense of satisfaction, we must admit that playing with dolls is what makes his or her life worth living in his or her present condition since this is what he or she enjoys doing, and so we should provide him or her with dolls, even if between his or her playing sessions he or she cannot remember having been playing with dolls, so that he or she is only aware of the fact that he or she enjoys this activity when he or she is actually engaging in it. This means that a person with enough psychological insight will know what makes the lives of others worth living to them, a knowledge which may be used in moral judgement-making.

STAGE THEORIES AND WHY THEY FAIL

In everyday language we use the expression maturity both in the meaning of mental adulthood as such, and as related to a certain biological age, with a different kind of maturity for each age group. For example there can be a maturity of childhood, another of adolescence, a third of adulthood, and a fourth of old age, and a person is called mature if he reasons and behaves in a way which could be expected from someone of his own age group. Persons are thus to fulfil certain age-specific criteria for passing as mature. But we also seem to relate our everyday conception of matur-

ity to how we expect a mentally adult person to be, which is not directly age-specific: We tend to imagine an ideal man or woman who fulfils certain criteria.

When we say that a person behaves in a mature way, we mean that he or she behaves in a way which we expect either from a person of his or her own age or from someone who is biologically older than the agent him- or herself, or which we expect from a mental adult in general; when we say that a person behaves in an immature way, we mean that he or she violates certain basic demands which we make either on a person of his or her own biological age, or on a mental adult in general. With a concept of maturity relative to age, children can be mature in the meaning of being intellectually and emotionally more developed than what can be expected of children of their age; in the meaning of mental adulthood, of course children cannot be mature at all. We will see that it is not possible to construct a stage theory of moral development and thus of moral maturity relative to age defined by the contents of different stages, which can be confirmed in psychological examinations where all persons examined can be assigned a stage with full certainty, and such theories also fail to give a convincing description of the character of moral development as such, i.e. how development takes place from one stage to another. This means that the expression 'stage of life' is vague and that it cannot be used convincingly in academic psychology to describe the maturity of human beings. In the light of such difficulties it seems more fruitful to analyse maturity in the meaning of mental adulthood.

We will examine the most famous stage theory of moral development, namely that of Kohlberg, and we will show why the concept of stage of life cannot be given an adequate explanation.

In his *The Philosophy of Moral Development. Moral Stages and the Idea of Justice*, Kohlberg distinguishes between three phases, the pre-conventional, the conventional, and the post-conventional.[14] Each phase contains two stages. In the pre-conventional phase, stage one means that the agent is oriented towards punishment and obedience. The agent acknowledges only the literal meaning of the moral demand, not its meaning or function. Might is right, and to be good means to obey. On stage two, the agent is directed towards instrumental goals and interchange. Here morality is a question of doing people services for the sake of getting favours in return. The aim is

[14] Kohlberg, *The Philosophy of Moral Development* pp. 51-54.

the satisfaction of one's own needs, but the other person's right to satisfaction is acknowledged. In the conventional phase, the first stage means a concentration on interpersonal expectations, relations, and conformity. The agent is characterised by a turning towards other people, and by wanting to fulfil the needs and wishes of others. Confidence, respect and gratitude in relations are keywords, and the other person is now regarded as a subject. On the next stage, the agent is directed towards the preservation of the social system. He or she entertains a conscious relation to the social order. Institutions are regarded as norms, and the other is now the system. The keyword is respect for the law. In the last phase, the post-conventional, the first stage means that the agent formulates a social contract. The agent now has attained an even wider social perspective. This is the situation of the law-giving subject, conscious of concrete demands as well as of wider social requirements of society as a whole. The final stage means that the agent formulates universal moral principles. On this highest possible stage of human moral development we will find persons like Martin Luther King and Mahatma Gandhi, people who proclaim universal principles which give a motivation for the contract ethics of the previous stage. In practice, this highest kind of ethics is characterised by the taking over of roles: The agent imagines him- or herself as being in the roles of each of the persons in the situation, taking equal notice to the demands of each, and acting as if he or she had no knowledge of which person he or she actually were in the situation. The morality on the post-conventional stages is not supported by society, which makes it more difficult to attain.

There are a great number of other stage theories. One of the more well-known is that of Erikson as put forward in his *Childhood and Society*, where the stages are basic trust, autonomy, initiative, industry, identity, intimacy, generativity (by which Erikson means productivity or creativity), and ego integrity. Ego integrity includes all the earlier qualities, but primarily implies a sense of meaning and acceptance of one's life, Erikson says:

> It is the ego's accrued assurance of its proclivity for order and meaning. It is a post-narcissistic love of the human ego… as an experience which conveys some world order and spiritual sense, no matter how dearly paid for. It is the acceptance of one's

> one and only life cycle as something that had to be and that, by necessity, permitted of no substitutions…[15]

Unfortunately, there are a lot of problems with the stage theories. Kohlberg's own theory was not supported even by his own examinations: On the Turkish countryside, no results above stage 4 could be established,[16] and stage 6 could not be verified in any of Kohlberg's examinations.[17] In later life, Kohlberg chose to abandon both stages 5 and 6 as the goal of education, and confined himself to an educational aim on stage 4: People should be educated to becoming good citizens.[18]

In her *Ego Development: Conceptions and Theories*, Loevinger discusses the psychological concept of 'ego development' or 'character development', which she claims to be the same as moral development in ethics. According to Loevinger, the defenders of stage theories of moral development want to assume one single source for all the suggested developmental sequences, thus claiming that all stage theories give their own versions of one single developmental sequence, but there is no crucial evidence for the postulate of one single source.[19] Though of course there are similarities between the theories, they also differ in important respects, and the choice of criteria for the stages is highly subjective. It is difficult to compare different stage theories, since it is difficult to say how the stages in one theory are related to the stages in another theory. The so-called ages are theoretical constructions; in practical life there is no sharp line between childhood and adolescence or between adolescence and adulthood. Humans continuously change, and they act differently from time to time, whereas the stage theories are static and imply a permanence that does not exist. In tests of so-called ego development, a kind of stage theories which come close to those of moral development, results give at hand that there are no absolutely certain signs of any stage, only probabilistic ones, and a certain behaviour may reflect more than one kind of development. Everyone displays behaviour at more than one stage.[20]

---

[15] Erikson, *Childhood and Society* p. 268.
[16] Garz, *Lawrence Kohlberg zur Einführung* p. 98.
[17] ibid. p. 62.
[18] ibid. p. 127.
[19] Loevinger, *Ego Development* pp. 187-188.
[20] ibid. pp. 183-184.

What Loevinger does not mention in her study but which is still of relevance to us here is that the norm is unclear: Some people are late in their intellectual and emotional development, some are very early. Should we base our model on those who are the most developed in a certain 'age', or on the average? If we choose the first alternative, only very few will fulfil the requirements; if we choose the second, we have to decide what to do with those who are vastly 'before their age' in mental development and thus do not correspond to the model, since they have already left this 'stage', that is, they have fulfilled the requirements for higher stages. If the maturity of adolescence is, say, to create an identity of one's own, then we will certainly have some problems with a 17 year-old who does not consider this since he or she is occupied with taking care of his or her offspring and fulfilling his or her responsibilities as a company worker and in his or her other social relationships, which some psychologists would probably describe as the central questions of adulthood.

According to Loevinger, difficult cases have been treated differently by different theorists; some have broadened their definitions of the stages, others have postulated substages, but most of the researchers have simply ignored the problem. If everyone, without exception, shall be assigned just one stage, then the stages must be given an abstract, not specific meaning, and things that are different must be treated as equivalent. The so-called Conformist Stage for example can be defined as including all those for whom conformity or *nonconformity* is the central issue of life. Then the Bohemian who tries to be nonconformist will appear at this stage.[21] The problem with this kind of solution is of course that one broadens the concepts until they are too broad to be practically useful, and the move from one stage to another turns into a very wide leap. If one introduces more stages or substages, it is difficult to know where to make a halt, since the substages could be further divided into second order substages, etc. More stages which are more specific only makes it more difficult to categorise a person on a certain stage concerning different questions and in different situations. The same person is scored on different stages for specific circumstances concerning things like impulse control, interpersonal relations, and conscious preoccupations, for example at work and in private.[22] And even with substages defined in

[21] Loevinger, *Ego Development* p. 195.
[22] ibid. pp. 199-200.

detail, the problem remains how the stages are connected to each other, how one stage can lead to the next. This is possible only through abstractions, and it was to avoid abstractions that the substages were introduced. And how does the step from one stage to another takes place – as leaps, or continuously? Different analyses of the same test material show both continuity and discontinuity. A person's behaviour cannot reflect stages that have not yet been reached. Does the next stage represent a latent ability? There is no consensus among the researchers concerning substages, even less than concerning the main stages.[23]

Another possibility mentioned by Loevinger is that all persons represent all stages in their mental lives but that some characteristics, the criteria of a certain stage, currently dominate in a certain person. Development then means that other psychological entities become dominant, which means that one fulfils other criteria.[24] But it is doubtful whether even this can be said to make justice to the complexity and subtlety of human psychology (apart from the fact that 'stage' here has a very odd meaning); perhaps two or more criteria dominate, from different stages. Yet another concept type sees the stage in terms of the core functioning of a structured or organised whole. This third conception is supported by the view of the ego as an organisation, of structural conceptions, or of the idea of equilibration, where there might be a certain divergence over or under the level of core functioning. Unfortunately the concept 'core function' cannot be translated into a unique scoring algorithm, Loevinger says.[25]

It is not possible to create a stage theory which satisfies all psychological researchers, one which contains stages which all would say correspond to real moral development. Although it may seem reasonable to think that human moral development runs from selfishness, as intentionally working for one's own good at the costs of others, over conventionalism as described by Kohlberg, related above, to a responsible autonomy, where one is able to reflect oneself on what is correct in a certain situation and to act accordingly, this scheme is much too simple. Different persons can develop intellectually and emotionally through different lines of development, some

[23] Loevinger, *Ego Development* pp. 207, 209.
[24] ibid. p. 209.
[25] ibid. pp. 209-210.

through conventionalism, others through idealism and revolution and the disappointment that follows. Most probably not even the developmental process of one man can be covered by one single stage theory. And some people continue to develop mentally during their whole life, whereas others loose their mental flexibility, become more one-sided, even fanatical in their unwillingness to see and accept different possibilities, which may be seen both as a personal and as a moral failure. There is no general continuous development, and it is by no means certain that maturity comes by itself with rising age without a conscious effort.

In addition, one may ask why one should strive to fulfil the criteria on one stage when one could strive to fulfil those on the next, or even those on the highest stage. And even if one possesses the virtue or principle on a certain stage and on earlier stages or in several spheres not hierarchically ordered, one cannot be said to be genuinely mature before having fulfilled all criteria, all aspects of maturity. According to the way we use the expression maturity in the meaning of mental adulthood, maturity is just one, and forms a unity. But if only the persons on the highest stage can be considered mature, then the stage theories are useless.

This shows that the everyday expression of maturity as relative to age cannot be verified in psychological examinations; it does not allow for a clear description, but instead it must remain vague. But as we have noted, 'maturity' is also used in the meaning of mental adulthood as such.

GOODNESS

Now that we have chosen to analyse the everyday expression of maturity in terms of mental adulthood as such, we must examine in which way this expression differs from the everyday expression of goodness, which will help clarifying the everyday meaning of maturity as mental adulthood.

Aristotle's theory of goodness will shed light on the different meanings of goodness as the expression is used today.

We have noted that Aristotle's ethics is a theory of excellence of character, which means that it is a theory of the morally good man. The good man as presented to us in the *Nicomachean Ethics* is in possession of certain dispositions which make him per-

form his function well, which means acting in the best way in the actual situation. Aristotle lists a number of such dispositions, intellectual and moral; the intellectual ones are dependent on instruction, the moral ones on habituation, and he claims the good man to have all of these. This means that Aristotle's ethics is based on the individual's own moral competence rather than on general moral rules which are to be acted on by everyone. This competence, which is theoretical as well as practical – knowing what is good and judging how best to realise this good, and acting on this judgement - is dependent not on age but on training and on experience.

For Aristotle, the essence of being good or bad is doing right or wrong,[26] which means that being good primarily means acting well, and so in the definition of goodness, acting is prior to knowing what is good and prior to judging what to do. On the other hand just incidentally or compulsively doing good does not mean being good. Goodness requires knowing what one is doing, i.e., having full knowledge of the object involved, the action itself, and its result, and it requires acting with intention, and choosing what is good for its own sake.[27]

Aristotle assumes the existence of the good as an absolute value: What is by nature good is in itself good and pleasant to the good man, and the good man feels pleasure in the consciousness of what is in itself good, he says,[28] and the good man wishes what is good as such, the true good, not simply the apparent good. The good man judges every situation correctly, and in every situation what appears to him is the truth.[29]

Aristotle's concept of excellence of character or moral goodness is used in the meaning of a moral efficiency, that is, judging and acting well morally, which means that it is a concept of goodness which is oriented towards success: The one who manages to live according to morality for the right reasons is a good man. We have already noted that Aristotle's concept of moral goodness as the competence to fulfil oneself through social activities differs from the way we use 'morality' today, since today's everyday expression of morality is exclusively concerned with one's treatment of others. But there is yet another problem with Aristotle's concept of moral goodness, namely the

[26] Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 1113b11-14.
[27] ibid. 1105a30-32.
[28] ibid. 1170a14-15, b4-5.
[29] ibid. 1113a22-26, 29-33.

fact that Aristotelian moral goodness seems to be identical with technical goodness or skilfulness. In his introuction to the *Nicomachean Ethics* Barnes says:

> [M]oral goodness is treated as though it were a skill of some sort – a skill at being human --- [W]e might suppose that Aristotle is dealing, primarily, not with moral goodness but with human expertise or the technique of being a good man; the immediate aim of the *Ethics* is to make us 'good men' – not morally good men, but expert or successful human beings.[30]

In daily language today we use the expression 'good' for people as such, for their intentions, for their different qualities, for their judgements, and for their actions. An act is called good if it is considered useful, either to oneself or to others. Intentions are called good if they aim at realising good, i.e., useful, actions for the sake of others, and a judgement if it correctly tells one how to perform such actions.

We have noted that Aristotelian goodness primarily connotes successful acting. Today what comes closest to Aristotle's concept of moral goodness is the everyday expression of being a good citizen. The good citizen performs his social tasks as a member of the community: towards his family, his friends, his working colleagues, and towards other citizens with whom he is not acquainted, which means that like Aristotelian goodness, good citizenship too is oriented towards success, namely in performing one's social tasks.

In everyday language, 'rational' means that something is appropriate, i.e., adapted, suited, to its purpose. A rational judgement in the everyday sense of the expression is a judgement which says how best to realise certain intentions, i.e., with the least effort, with the least risk of injury, and with the highest chance of success. The good citizen is rational in the sense of having a competence in fulfilling his social tasks, in judging and in acting according to what is demanded of him. Being a good citizen requires some reflection, on what is demanded of one and of what one must do to fulfil these demands, which means that it requires a certain understanding of priorities, of who is in most need of support in the situation and of which action best serves the purpose of supporting the person who is in most need of help. But nevertheless good citizenship allows for a considerable degree of habituation: What counts

[30] Barnes, *Introduction* p. 29.

is successfully performing one's social tasks, even if this is done unreflectedly and thus rather mechanically.

The everyday expression of good citizenship is connected to a certain meaning of the everyday expression of autonomy, namely in the basic sense of being able to care for oneself, to support oneself without the continuous help of others. This shows that the everyday expression of good citizenship is also connected to the everyday expression of prudence, in the meaning of judging correctly what is good for oneself and acting on this judgement.

The Aristotelian good man is not dependent on support from others, but still he is not autonomous in the wider sense of being able to choose the way he wants to be, to modify himself according to his own wishes. He is raised to goodness and this is what he is: The same things always please or displease the good man, since he virtually never changes his mind,[31] and good men wish and pursue the same things, having the same outlook.[32] Likewise, good citizenship as the expression is used in daily language today does not require autonomy in this wider sense, since what is required of the good citizen is simply that he lives according to law and custom, not that he is able to choose what kind of man he wants to be.

But the good citizen is no ideal man in the Aristotelian sense of possessing a number of virtues like courage, wittiness, or hospitality. Being a good citizen simply means performing one's social tasks; it says nothing about any personal characteristics. Thus, and again contrary to Aristotle, the good citizen might act against his own wish, which means that good citizenship does not require having good intentions, which as we have noted means aiming at realising good actions for the sake of others. The reason for the good citizen's acting according to law and custom is his own affair; he must not necessarily intend the good of others for their sake. What is relevant is simply that he acts in support of others and therewith of his community. He may well act with the (ultimate) aim of fulfilling himself. But as far as he is performing his social tasks successfully, for what reason whatever, no-one can accuse him of not being a good citizen. And he must not intend to do more than what his social tasks require of him, that is, he must not intend any actions which are supereroga-

[31] Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 1166a27-29.
[32] ibid. 1167b5-9.

tive, which go beyond what morality demands. As distinguished from Aristotle, being a good citizen also does not require knowledge of moral truths, of what is right or wrong absolutely, only of what is required of one as a member of society, which is what the law and the more important customs prescribe. This has nothing to do with a conception of the good as being an absolute value with an objective existence, as in Aristotle.

But the good citizen according to our everyday expression is still not what we mean with *human* goodness: Human goodness, as we use the expression in daily language, is goodness of the heart, which means that it requires taking a certain mental attitude and experiencing certain feelings towards other people, notably of love of man as meaning an attitude of care for the individual immediately involved in the moral problem situation, as well as an intense feeling towards him or her. This implies having good intentions in the everyday sense, of supporting others for their sake, and the more supererogative the intentions, the more human goodness. Just intending to do what is demanded of one and nothing more is 'good' simply as being acceptable, as not being blameworthy, nothing more.

When we say that someone is a good person, we do not call him or her morally good, but simply 'good', and most probably 'good' here is not a shorter from of 'morally good', but instead of 'humanly good', which is not as strongly oriented towards success as Aristotelian goodness and as good citizenship are.

In the way we use goodness concerning humans, saying that a certain person is good, 'a good man' or 'a good woman' rather than 'a good citizen', we do not mean that he or she is a moral expert in the Aristotelian sense, theoretically, in judgement, and practically, in action. As distinguished from good citizenship, human goodness, goodness as a man, as a human being, does not require rationality in the everyday sense of efficiency. Although the humanly good man's or woman's moral judgement always aims at what is good for some individual person, his or her moral judgement must not necessarily take all morally relevant aspects of a situation into regard. Human goodness only requires taking certain individuals into consideration, perhaps only one single individual; it does not require considering the group or society as a whole. This implies that human goodness does not require critical reflection, and thus no understanding of correct priorities.

A child can have an attitude of care and a loving feeling as well as good intentions towards others as well as an adult can, and thus we can well accept that children can possess human goodness, goodness of the heart, but since they do not have the adult's capacity for critical reflection, they do not have the adult's capacity for making mature judgements, which are good moral judgements which not only correspond to the demands of morality, in which case they might be good accidentally, as will be explained in Chapter 4; they are based on true factual judgements which take all or most morally relevant aspects of a situation into consideration. This implies that we do not associate human goodness with intellectual development. This points to the fact that although the man or woman with human goodness, who has good intentions, will make moral judgements, these moral judgements must not necessarily be mature moral judgements, since mature (moral) judgements are always based on morally relevant, true factual judgements, or else they are only accidentally good. A person can well be a 'good man' or a 'good woman' without understanding how he or she must act so as to support other people; he or she can fail to understand how best to help others because he or she makes factual judgements concerning the situation, e.g. concerning what a person needs, which are false. And he or she may neglect the context, which ultimately means that his or her moral judgement does not take the possible effects of the action, and other similar actions, on society as a whole into consideration. This means that a person with good intentions is not necessarily a good moral judge.

A 'good man' or a 'good woman' today, i.e., a man or woman with human goodness, is not necessarily courageous, witty, generous, and what else Aristotle attributes to his man of excellent character.[33] He or she loves his or her fellow-men and intends to do good to them, but if he or she fails to do good, because of a bad judgement or because of personal weakness – fear, for example – we would still call him or her a good man or woman as long as we are sure of his or her feelings and intentions. We would call a person good who helps another person who is in need of help, although a third person may be in more need of help and although the first person would be able to help this third person, would he or she only consider the situation

[33] Barnes offers a list of the Aristotelian moral virtues on p. 104 in the *Nicomachean Ethics* in the translation by J.A.K. Thomson, revised by Hugh Tredennick.

somewhat more thoroughly. And in fact we would call a person 'good' although he or she is trying to help a person who is in no need of help, and although there are others present who actually need help. For example, we would surely call a person 'good' who spent an hour on carrying a wounded man to a place where he could receive medical treatment without having checked whether he were still alive, so that in fact he or she would be carrying a dead corpse instead of helping other wounded men nearby who were still alive. And in fact we might even call a man or woman 'good' although he or she acts *badly*, doing harm to others. A fictional example is Prince Myshkin in Dostoyevsky's *The Idiot*.

Prince Myshkin comes back to Russia after four years of mental treatment in Switzerland - uncured. In St. Petersburg he makes the acquaintance of some far relatives, including the twenty year-old Aglaia Epanchin, but also of Nastasya Filippovna, a woman of bad reputation. Although 26 years old, Myshkin is mentally much of a child, and he confesses that he does not like being with grown-up people, because he feels oppressed, and that his companions have always been children. He has a child's spontaneity and honesty, which makes a good first impression on many people. Aglaia says that she has never met anyone with more noble simplicity and boundless trustfulness, and according to Nastasya Filippovna, Myshkin is the first person she has ever met whom she has believed in as a sincere friend:

> 'Here's a find!' she said suddenly, turning again to Darya Alexeyevna. 'And simply from goodness of heart, too; I know him. I have found a benefactor!'[34]

And a certain general calls Myshkin ideally generous and says that he has complete confidence in Myshkin's sincerity of heart and in the nobility of his feelings. And he exclaims:

> 'Prince! you are so kind, so good-hearted, that I'm sometimes positively sorry for you.'[35]

Myshkin is always full of compassion for those who suffer, and he is even filled with pity at the sight of a sad face on a photograph, as when he sees the picture of

[34] Dostoyevsky, *The Idiot* p. 152.
[35] ibid. p. 470.

Nastasya Filippovna, and his compassion for her never leaves him. Yevgeny Pavlovitch, Myshkin's friend, says to him about his returning to Russia:

> 'As a youth in Switzerland you yearned for your native country, and longed for Russia as for an unknown land of promise. You had read a great many books about Russia, excellent books perhaps, but pernicious for you. You arrived in the first glow of eagerness to be of service, so to say; you rushed, you flew headlong to be of service.'[36]

Myshkin is often day-dreaming. Alexandra, Aglaia's sister, calls him 'very disconnected',[37] and Dostoyevsky writes:

> He was perhaps prejudiced and predisposed to favourable impression.[38]

Myshkin cannot understand the subtleties of human relations; he takes the aristocratic acquaintances of Aglaia's family to be just what they seem to be to him, namely elegant, simple-hearted, and clever, and he does not understand that they think they are doing Aglaia's family a great honour by paying them a visit. He is not observant of other people, and his absent-mindedness makes him incapable of noticing their reactions - when people are about to start laughing at him, or when someone tries to avoid his company, or when someone wants to ask him a question but is too shy or sensitive to ask, he simply does not notice this and therefore fails to react correctly.

Myshkin's naivety further makes him behave much too personally towards people he hardly knows. He tells strangers and new acquaintances about his personal history, his illness and his social difficulties, to their great embarrassment. In addition he openly insults others without understanding what he is doing, among others Aglaia's parents and their friends.

Both Aglaia and Nastasya Filippovna fall in love with Myshkin because of his simplicity and honesty, but he ends up with making both women deeply unhappy. Myshkin is himself guilty of their falling in love with him: Already at his second meeting with Nastasya Filippovna, and enchanted by her beauty, he tells her that he loves her and makes her a proposal of marriage. Later he writes a short letter to Aglaia from Moscow which lets Aglaia suspect that he is in love with her: Of the

[36] Dostoyevsky, *The Idiot* p. 544.
[37] ibid. p. 54.
[38] ibid. p. 500.

three sisters he saw only Aglaia, he writes, and he adds that he needs her very much, and that he has a great desire that she should be happy. But Myshkin takes no responsibility for any of these actions, since he does not understand their effects on the two women. And he does not understand the women's jealousy of each other, for which reason he repeatedly hurts them by approaching first the one, then the other, then the first once again, etc.

His indecisiveness is a great burden to both women. When asked directly by Aglaia in front of her parents if he wants to marry her, he says yes, but he does nothing to make the marriage come true. Without noticing the effect of his words on Aglaia, he had told Aglaia that he would be prepared to sacrifice his own life just to make Nastasya Filippovna happy, and that he came to Pavlovsk, where Aglaia's family as well as Nastasya Filippovna spend their holiday, just for the sake of Nastasya Filippovna. And when at the end he has to choose between the two women, he does not understand the importance of the situation. Out of pity for Nastasya Filippovna he simply blames Aglaia for speaking harshly to the other woman, and when Aglaia is running away in despair, he tries to run after her. When Aglaia is gone he agrees to marry Nastasya Filippovna, but he does it somewhat casually, and later he says to his friend Yevgeny Pavlovitch that the marriage means nothing; *she* wants him to marry her.

This makes it obvious that Myshkin has agreed to marry Nastasya Filippovna out of pity. To his friend, Myshkin confesses that he wants to love both Aglaia and Nastasya Filippovna, but Yevgeny Pavlovitch comments that Aglaia loved him as a woman, like a human being, not like an abstract spirit, and that Myshkin has probably never loved any of the two women. Myshkin confesses that this may be true.

Myshkin's love for the two women is not, or at least not primarily, erotic. It is a Christian love, love of man, exhibiting itself in pity: Especially in his love for Nastasya Filippovna there is something of the tenderness for a sick, unhappy child. For this reason he cannot respond to these adult women's needs.

Even after having agreed to marry Nastasya Filippovna, Myshkin still tries to visit Aglaia to console her, but this is prevented by her family, who renounces all friendship and acquaintance with him. Aglaia is in a nervous and even hysterical state. When the wedding day approaches, Nastasya Filippovna becomes increasingly melancholic, and on the day before the wedding she is in despair, even in hysterics. On

her way to the wedding she elopes and is eventually murdered out of jealousy by Myshkin's rival Rogozhin.

In spite of his love of man and his pity, and in spite of his good intentions of being of service to others, Myshkin knows very little about life, and he does not understand his fellow men well enough for being able to judge competently what best to do, and his acting has devastating consequences for those who mean the most to him. The topic of the novel is the tragic personal and social failure of a genuinely good man.

All these examples point to the fact that 'human goodness' according to the way we use the expression in daily language connotes certain feelings and having good intentions, but not necessarily good judgement and good acting.

Since the everyday expression of human goodness does not imply making morally relevant, true factual judgements, it also does not imply prudence as judging correctly what is good for oneself and acting accordingly, which is something which we associate with mental adults. Human goodness is even negatively related to prudence: The more prudence, the less one's intentions are exclusively directed towards supporting others for their sake, and the less human goodness.

Human goodness thus is exclusively directed towards others, and it implies intending to support others for their sake, without any thought of personal gain. The humanly good man's or woman's intentions often go beyond the mere fulfilling of his or her social tasks: Because of his or her love of man, which contains very intensive feelings, he or she often intends to do more than what is required of him or her, namely what morality in the everyday sense of the word demands. This means that his or her intentions are supererogative. He or she may intend to give away everything he or she possesses, by which he or she would ruin him- or herself, or to sacrifice his or her life for the life of another person, like taking that person's place at an execution. The highest form of human goodness is a love of man which takes the form of self-sacrifice. This means that human goodness can be self-destructive, and as we have seen, this is not demanded by morality: Morality demands of us to act in favour of others, instead of acting in favour of ourselves, but it does not demand of us that we ruin or destroy our own lives.

Like good citizenship, human goodness does not require autonomy in the wider sense of being able to choose the way one wants to be, to modify oneself according to

one's own wishes. The humanly good man or woman may well be so involved in thinking of what is good for others that it never even occurs to him or her to question his or her way of living. A humanly good man or woman is highly emotional, experiencing a strong love for mankind, whose intensity makes it impossible for him or her to take a rest from his or her judging and acting. But since human goodness does not imply critical reflection, and since it is contrary to prudence, it does not even necessarily imply autonomy in the basic sense of being able to support oneself independently. Contrary to the good citizen, the humanly good man or woman may well be dependent on continuous support from other people to the extent that he or she is not able to live according to morality, i.e., to fulfil his or her role in society.

MATURITY AS MENTAL ADULTHOOD

The discussion of goodness in the previous section will help us clarify the everyday expression of maturity as mental adulthood. Maturity as mental adulthood avoids the vague concept of stage of life, which makes it much easier to define than the everyday expression of maturity relative to age. Now we will try to give a more specific picture of what mental adulthood means in the moral sphere according to our everyday semantic practice.

In the light of the three concepts of goodness discussed above, the Aristotelian one, that of the good citizen, and that of human goodness, it is clear that our everyday expression of maturity comes closest to the concept of the good citizen. We do not associate moral maturity with a project of personal self-fulfilment, as in Aristotle, but also not with just having good intentions, as in the case of human goodness. On the other hand, the everyday expression of maturity also means more than just performing one's social tasks successfully by adjusting oneself to law and custom, as in the case of the good citizen.

Officially, adulthood begins when a person comes of age, when he reaches majority and thus lawful age. In many countries this official adulthood begins at the age of 18. On reaching this age, one is accepted as an adult: by other individuals who have already reached this age, which means that one is accepted as an equal, and one is now expected to conform to the social customs of adults. But one is also accepted as an

adult by the bureaucratic system, which means that one can be sentenced to full punishment for having broken the law. This acceptance by society shows that one is now supposed to be able to understand and adjust oneself according to the laws and social customs of one's society, which means that one is seen as being responsible for one's actions, and thus that one can rightly be blamed and punished for not adjusting oneself as expected. This means that an official adult is supposed to be a mental adult at least in the basic sense of being able to understand and adjust him- or herself according to official law and to the more important customs. This means being able to function in ways which are seen as being appropriate for adults in a basic or minimal sense.

According to Coan, we call that 'normal' what we judge as desirable in our society, which includes acquiring a certain social façade, playing roles, learning skills for successful social interaction.[39] This conception of maturity corresponds to the everyday expression of the good citizen as described above, and certainly the everyday meaning of maturity and that of being a good citizen partly overlap: The way we use maturity in daily language implies that the mature person actually fulfils his or her role in society in practical action, i.e. in contributing to the good of the community, and therewith to all its members, as a good citizen, as a good member of society.

That adults are expected to be good citizens in the everyday sense of the word means that they are supposed to exhibit a social competence, which means mastering skills for social interaction in a social roleplay which makes it possible to relate successfully to others. This may make one suspect that maturity is orientated towards practical action, focusing on social adjustment, i.e., behaving in the way expected by others, notably calmly, slowly, without showing much feeling, without showing much interest, behaving in a way which we interpret as careful for avoiding causing irritation, and performing those tasks which are expected of one by others – by family members, friends, working colleagues, etc. Such a social competence may come close to a kind of social virtuosity which allows for successful interactions with others; such a person fulfils his or her social tasks but does nothing more than what is demanded of him or her.

[39] Coan, *Hero, Artist, Sage, or Saint?* pp. 74-75.

This meaning of maturity, as good citizenship, implies that anyone can pass as mature who adjusts him- or herself to a social role of being useful to others instead of harming them. If maturity were simply the same as good citizenship, then everyone who lived according to law and the more important customs would be classified as being mature. But is this the way we use the expression in daily language? The reasons for adjustment are not taken into consideration: Does one really hold the views shared by the group to be correct, or perhaps one is simply adjusting oneself with the aim of better obtaining one's own aims?

As distinguished from the case of the good citizen, where good citizenship consists only in acting, maturity connotes also certain inner qualities. From a man's or woman's judgements and behaviour, we make a judgement concerning his or her inner life, and this inner life we judge as mature or as immature. 'Maturity' is used in connection with intellectual and emotional development, and what we judge as mature or immature is a human mind. In addition, we often say that a person's judgement or acting is mature or immature. What we mean is that a 'mature judgement' is a good moral judgement, one which points to a good moral action, and which fulfils certain criteria of objectivity other than just being good, whereas a 'mature action' is a good moral action performed by a mature person, which means that it is the realisation of a mature judgement. Such an action fulfils the demands of morality, which means that it is useful to other people, either directly or indirectly. The nature of mature judgement and of mature action will be discussed in Chapter 4.

With mental adulthood we associate not only a certain way of behaving, but also a certain way of reasoning, of feeling and wanting. We often say that people who are far beyond the age of majority are 'no adults', and by this we mean that they lack what we expect to find in an adult person: A certain way of feeling and of wanting, of reasoning, believing, intending, and judging. Mental adulthood as we use the expression in daily life excludes strong emotional outbursts, wanting things which one can never hope to obtain, having destructive intentions concerning oneself and others, assessing the importance of things completely erroneously, unimportant things as important and vice versa, and having more important beliefs which do not correspond to reality, for example that everyone intends to hurt one, or forms of grave

superstition, like believing that the fact that one just saw a black cat means that the world is soon coming to an end.

When trying to grasp the meaning of the everyday expression of maturity as mental adulthood, we may note that 'immaturity' as the expression is used in daily language today may be easier to outline than that of maturity. Immaturity we can compare to childishness. Childishness is not directly related to the moral sphere: Although we tend to blame people for being childish, we use the expression in the meaning of holding unreflected, 'naïve' views which do not correspond to reality, and of being interested in, and of engaging in, activities which cannot give one a deeper sense of satisfaction as a sense of meaning of life. This means that we tend to associate childishness with incapacity for a 'higher', i.e. fuller, more valuable, kind of self-fulfilment. But this must not mean that the person has no good intentions and that he or she lacks certain morally relevant knowledge, and he or she may well be able to judge and act morally well, which means that we do not associate childishness directly with immorality. As distinguished from childishness, immaturity means being introvert and selfish, whereas the childish person can be extrovert and unselfish. With 'introversion' we mean self-reflection overriding reflection on other things so that the person is unduly occupied in his or her thoughts with his or her own inner life; with his or her own feelings, memories, beliefs, views, and judgements. With 'selfishness' we mean having selfish intentions, i.e., intending one's own good, either directly or indirectly, by supporting others with the hope of receiving help in return or by profiting from one's action in some other way. An introvert person is not necessarily very selfish: Although he or she is occupied by reflecting on his or her own inner life, he or she may not be very interested in supporting his or her own good, and he or she may even want to be helpful to others. Nastasya Filippovna in *The Idiot*, already discussed, is an example of this:

> Whether she were a woman who had read too much poetry as Yevgeny Pavlovitch had said, or simply mad, as Myshkin was convinced, in any case this woman – though she sometimes behaved with such cynicism and impudence – was really far more modest, soft, and trustful than might have been believed. It's true that she was

> full of romantic notions, of self-centred dreaminess and capricious fantasy, but yet there was much that was strong and deep in her…[40]

On the other hand the selfish person can be interested in others and he or she can be very communicative, but his or her interest is no concern for others, i.e., it is not interest in others for their sake, but an interest in others for his or her own sake, with the motive of benefiting him- or herself. Immaturity implies both introversion and selfishness; as we commonly use the expression immaturity, an introvert person is even more immature if he or she is also selfish, and a selfish person is even more immature if he or she is also introvert.

Introversion and selfishness both imply a continuous mental attitude towards oneself, introversion of taking a mental attitude of interest in oneself, which is not affirmative, it is no attitude of liking oneself, but an attitude of wanting to understand oneself, which reduces one's interest in understanding others, although one can still want and therefore intend to do good to others. Selfishness on the other hand implies taking a mental attitude of affirmation towards oneself, i.e., of liking oneself. Introversion and selfishness together implies continuously taking an attitude of concern for oneself, which means taking an interest in oneself for one's own sake, which is stronger than one's concern for others. Recalling Dostoyevsky's words about Nastasya Filippovna's 'self-centred dreaminess', quoted above, we can widen this definition of self-centredness as introversion to one which combines the two aspects of immaturity we have described, since in everyday language today, being self-centred connotes not only being introvert, but also being selfish.

Consequently the mental attitude of concern for oneself equals an attitude of self-centredness, which thus means directing one's attention towards one's own mental life, particularly towards one's own wishes and the thoughts and feelings: fear, sadness, anger etc., which these give rise to, thus being occupied with one's own personal interests, and being concerned for oneself, i.e., being interested in oneself for one's own sake, for which reason one wants things for one's own sake even though one knows that the satisfaction of these wishes would mean disrespecting the (more important) interests of others.

---

[40] Dostoyevsky, *The Idiot* pp. 533-534.

For this reason immaturity, as distinguished from childishness, is related to the sphere of morality: An immature person who is both introvert and selfish lacks good intentions, which are intentions to support the good of others for their sake, and because of his or her lack of interest in others, he or she is unable to judge well morally.

In ordinary life we also use the expression immaturity for people who react with violent outbursts of anger, exalted joy, or otherwise sudden and violent changes in their mood. The reason is probably that a person who is highly emotional is unable to do what he or she wants: He or she is not able to be attentive to information relevant for judging how to obtain what he or she wants, and his or her feelings also tend to raise wishes which point in other directions than his or her more important priorities. This means that strong emotionality makes one not only incapable of being morally useful, but also of being useful to oneself, i.e., of being prudent in the everyday sense of the word.

The fact that an immature person who is both introvert, selfish, and highly emotional, lacks prudence means that he or she may well act so as to hurt himself in his/her striving to benefit him-/herself. Since he/she is not rational enough to understand that acting in support of others as a good citizen does may well be profiting for oneself, he/she has no wish to judge and act morally well, not even with the aim of supporting him-/herself, and since he/she lacks this wish, he/she does not bother to inform him-/herself of the morally relevant aspects of a certain situation, which means that he/she lacks a morally relevant knowledge, and for this reason he/she cannot make good moral judgements other than accidentally. This is the reason why, like with childishness, we use the expression immaturity in the meaning of holding unreflected, 'naïve' views which do not correspond to reality, although in the case of childishness these views are no views of direct moral relevance, while in the case of immaturity these views are directly relevant for moral judgement and thus for morally relevant acting.

An immature person according to everyday language is either introvert, selfish, or highly emotional, and in most cases he or she is all of this at once. In all three cases he or she is self-centred. Such a person can still be fairly autonomous in the basic sense of being able to take care of him- or herself without continuous external support, but he or she is not necessarily useful to him- or herself in a deeper sense, and

he or she does not live up to the more important demands from the external world, as expected of an adult in society, which are the demands expressed by morality. This means that the immature person's – very limited while basic or minimal – autonomy has no moral relevance, since it does not serve a life according to morality. And since the immature person lacks prudence, he or she is not even motivated to fulfil the criteria of being a good citizen for his or her own sake. For this reason, the immature man or woman is not of much help to either to him- or herself or to other people, and he or she may even be a danger to him- or herself and to others. And although in the case of self-centredness as meaning just introversion and strong emotionality, the immature person may in fact have good intentions, wanting and intending to support others for their sake, in which case he or she may fulfil the criteria for human goodness, he or she is still not able to make mature judgements and act on them other than accidentally.

Since we tend to use the expression of immaturity as the opposite of maturity, this description of immaturity would imply that 'maturity' is used in the everyday meaning of being extrovert and unselfish, i.e., being interested in and concerned for other people for their sake, and being calm, i.e., being free of strong emotionality. Lacking self-centredness requires lacking both introversion, selfishness, and strong emotionality. Lacking selfishness implies having good intentions, and lacking introversion and strong emotionality are basic requirements for being able to make mature judgements in the everyday sense of the expression.

But a complete lack of self-centredness would mean never being occupied with oneself in one's thoughts and never wanting anything for oneself, and never experiencing any strong feelings whatever, and such a man would be like a machine or a kind of otherworldly saint. Maturity must allow for some self-centredness, since without self-centredness one cannot live. As a human being, one is not able to overcome all one's needs, and all men have their own personal interests and likings – and their bad days. A certain self-centredness is needed either to overcome immediate personal problems or to avoid future problems which will inhibit one's thinking and acting and thus one's theoretical and practical moral competence. But the less self-centredness, the better the conditions for maturity. Such a necessary self-centredness we do not call 'selfishness', since it does not mean the striving to support oneself at

the direct costs of others, but only at the indirect costs of others, i.e., one's self-support steals time and energy which theoretically, although hardly practically, could have been used to support others. The selfish person on the other hand strives to support him- or herself much more than what is necessary to satisfy one's basic needs and to overcome immediate personal problems and to avoid future ones which will inhibit one's moral competence. If we compare this to the Aristotelian good man, we find that although the Aristotelian good man takes an interest in others, and although he is emotionally controlled, and although he takes an active part in social life and supports the good of the community, the fact that he loves himself the most, and that the ultimate aim of his moral acting is to benefit himself means that he is clearly more self-centred than what is necessary for leading a moral life.

In Chapter 2 we will show that the opposite of self-centredness corresponds to a certain use of the everyday expression of sympathy, which contains friendly feelings of joy at human intercourse and an attitude of concern for others, i.e., of interest in others for their sake. Sympathy directs the agent's attention towards others and makes him or her receptive to morally relevant information, which allows for making morally relevant, true factual judgements, judgements which provide the agent with a knowledge of the different aspects of the situation and of how these aspects are connected, which gives an overview of the moral situation, and it also gives an insight in how the situation at hand relates to other situations. This shows which possibilities are offered, and thus the different alternatives for action, and thus what can be done and by whom. But sympathy for others also makes the situation, the moral problem, important to the person, through the fact that the lives of the others in the situation and what makes their lives worth living to them becomes important to one. As will be explained further in Chapter 2, the mature person's dominating attitude and emotional state is not love of man, as is the case in the humanly good man or woman, but sympathy, which lacks the intensity of love of man. In Chapter 3 we will show that a certain meaning of 'sympathy' implies a certain meaning of 'autonomy' according to the way we use the expression in everyday language, namely one which is morally relevant, which makes it possible for the agent to make mature judgements, and which motivates him or her to judgement-making and to acting. An autonomy formed by sympathy of a certain kind thus gives a moral competence in

judging and in acting according to morality. The intensity in love of man on the other hand, according to the way in which we use the expression 'love of man' in everyday language, excludes sympathy. As will be shown in the next chapter, sympathy in the everyday sense is not compatible with intensity, since it is used for human relations which allow for, perhaps even necessitate, a considerable distance socially and emotionally. Thus love of man excludes the kind of autonomy which makes up maturity.

Maturity makes it possible for one to fulfil one's role in society, for taking one's responsibility as a member of the community, which means that it secures good citizenship. But as mental adulthood, maturity means not only adjusting oneself to the current custom in society, which could mean acting on other persons' judgements without having considered their correctness, or acting with the sole aim of fulfilling oneself. The mature man or woman must intend to do good to others for their sake. But although the Prince in Dostoyevsky's novel can be a good man according to the everyday meaning of human goodness today, in spite of the fact that the Prince's acting, although motivated by the wish to be of service to others, finally leads to the ruin of those whom he loves, he cannot be mature according to the way we use the expression in daily language. For maturity, as the expression is commonly used, good intentions are not enough. Like Aristotelian goodness and like good citizenship, maturity is oriented towards success: A mature man or woman must make good moral judgements which are founded on morally relevant knowledge, which excludes that they are done accidentally, and he or she must actually live according to morality, i.e., act on his or her judgements.

The fact that the humanly good man's or woman's intentions are supererogative makes him or her into quite another kind of model, another kind of ideal, than the mature man or woman is. Sacrificing one's life for another person is a sign of human goodness, but it is not a sign of maturity: Earlier in this chapter we noted that we would not call a person who refused to sacrifice his or her own life to save others 'immoral', and now we may add that neither would we call him or her 'immature'. As being supererogative, i.e., more than what morality demands, self-sacrifice is neither mature nor immature, since maturity is concerned with the sphere of morals only.

As distinguished from human goodness, but on the line with being a good citizen, maturity allows for prudence; whereas love of man may motivate one to sacrifice one's own life, no-one would sacrifice his or her life for another just because of sympathy, which shows that sympathy allows for prudence. In fact maturity, as we commonly use the expression, even seems to *require* prudence. Maturity is not compatible with self-destructive behaviour; prudence includes being careful not to harm oneself unnecessarily, and we would not always, concerning all situations, say that a man or woman who supports others at the costs of him- or herself is more mature than a man or woman who does not: We would hardly call a person mature who ruins his or her own life in an attempt to help another person. The mature man or woman may give some money to the poor, for example, but not as much that his or her own financial situation is seriously threatened, which would be imprudent. This means that our everyday use of 'maturity' implies that a mature man or woman must necessarily make good prudential judgements and act on them, to secure a certain good for him- or herself.

The fact that prudence is a necessary requirement for maturity does not mean that the ultimate aim of the mature person's moral judging and acting can be self-fulfilment, as in Aristotle's ethics. The mature man or woman must intend the good of others solely for the sake of these others; there can be no ultimate aim of fulfilling oneself.

The mature person's prudence aims at protecting his or her own life and at securing that his or her life is worth living to him- or herself, which is necessary for a continuous moral competence over a longer period of time. Since maturity implies moral competence, the mature person's prudence restricts itself to what is necessary for keeping this moral competence, which means that the mature person's prudence serves his or her moral competence. For this reason, the mature man or woman is prepared to refrain from supporting his or her own good for the sake of supporting the good of others, except for in cases where the mature man's or woman's own life and/or what makes his or her life worth living in a basic sense are threatened. And since moral competence requires prudence, our mature man or woman, like the good citizen, will be prudent.

A mature man or woman must intend to fulfil his or her role in society instead of just living from society. This means that like the good acting required for good citizenship, the good acting required for maturity means fulfilling certain basic moral demands which means that the action is morally good in the limited sense of being morally acceptable, of not being blameworthy.

This means that like good citizenship, maturity does not require supererogative intentions; it is enough to intend to live according to the demands of morality. And consequently it does not require supererogative action; but as distinguished from the good citizen, who may do what is required of him or her with the ultimate aim of benefiting him- or herself, the mature person wants to live morally for the sake of others only. This means that whereas good citizenship does not require good intentions, maturity does.

Since maturity requires prudence, it requires critical reflection, and like good citizenship, it requires the capacity to take care of oneself without continuous external support, which corresponds to a basic autonomy as we use the expression in daily language. But unlike good citizenship, maturity implies autonomy as more than just being able to take care of oneself without continuing external support: The mature person is able to choose the way he or she wants to be, to modify him- or herself according to his or her own wishes, to question his or her own way of living.

Except for being able to make good prudential judgements, a mature man or woman must be able to judge how to realise his or her good intentions, which means that maturity requires being able to make mature judgements. A person who just intends to do good but who has no idea of how to bring this about we would not call mature, and likewise, a person who acts on the judgement of another person, thus doing what is morally right, but without understanding why, cannot be said to be mature. The mature person must make his or her own moral judgements, and these must be good judgements, which tell him or her how to realise his or her good intentions, i.e., how to apply morality to actual cases. Maturity makes one able to make mature judgements concerning one's own acting, what one should and should not do, and in addition it makes one competent in acting as a moral advisor to others.

As distinguished from human goodness, but like good citizenship, maturity requires rationality in the everyday sense of being appropriate, i.e., adapted, suited, to

its purpose. This means that maturity requires the capacity to make correct assessments of priorities, and of which actions will serve to realise a certain aim. We would not call the person earlier mentioned who was carrying a dead corpse instead of helping wounded men nearby who were still alive mature. This shows that maturity requires not only having good intentions concerning others and being prudent, i.e., judging and acting so as to protect one's own life and to secure that one's life is worth living to oneself; it also requires a morally relevant knowledge and thus making morally relevant, true factual judgements on which the good moral judgements are based: The fact that a person does not take all morally relevant aspects of a situation into consideration when making a moral judgement does not mean that he or she lacks human goodness, since he or she intends to do good, but it indicates that he or she lacks maturity. We demand more reflection from a mature man or woman than from a humanly good person, since the humanly good person may in fact be a child, whereas the mature person cannot.

This means that maturity requires understanding a moral problem situation, taking all or most kinds of morally relevant information into consideration.

As distinguished from the humanly good person but like the good citizen, the mature man or woman does not neglect the context in a moral problem situation, which means that his or her moral judgements take not only the individuals directly affected but also society as a whole into consideration. We have seen that in a case where a person's life is in danger, a humanly good person would not necessarily take the stability and permanence of society into consideration when judging how to act, i.e., whether to try to save the person or not; a mature person would, and as a result he or she could decide not to save the person's life. A typical example would be a case of stealing something to save the life of someone, which is against the law, and breaking the law may de-stabilise the society in which one lives, but if one does not steal, the person will die.

This means that whereas the morally good man according to Aristotle makes good moral judgements whose ultimate aim is the agent's own self-fulfilment, that is, whereas Aristotle does not distinguish between prudential and moral judgements, and whereas according to our everyday semantic practice, the man or woman with human goodness must have good intentions but he or she must not be able to make

either good prudential or good moral judgements, and whereas the good citizen must judge and act well but not necessarily with good intentions, the mature man or woman must both have good intentions, he or she must make both good prudential judgements and mature moral judgements, and he or she must act both prudentially and morally well.

By now it is clear that maturity in the everyday sense of the word is a complex phenomenon consisting of a multitude of aspects – feeling, taking certain attitudes towards certain objects, wanting, intending, judging, and behaving in ways appropriate for adults. Such a person is a man or woman who furthers morality in judging and in acting, and as we have noted, the aim of morality is to support the good of others and the stability of society. But in many cases, it may be *impossible* for the competent moral judge to follow his or her own judgement, even though it would be good for him- or herself if he or she would do so: he or she cannot make a try because he or she lacks the means – physical or mental strength (energy, courage etc.) the money necessary, and so on. This is not seldom the case in good moral advice given by old or sick people. The 'wise man' as traditionally conceived is old, and probably physically weak, perhaps even somewhat frightened, as long as this does not darken his exceptional insight in human matters. And in fact in many cases it will not even be good for the advisor himself to live according to the way he or she prescribes. He or she may come to a conclusion concerning right action which is recommendable to others, but which it would be devastating for him- or herself to act on. Here we must distinguish between immediately good for the person him- or herself, good for the person him- or herself in the longer perspective, immediately good for others, and good for others in the longer perspective. A good moral advice, according to the way we use the expression in everyday language, is always good for some human being, either immediately or in the long perspective, but this must not be the person who is to perform the action. In fact a good *moral* advice may be lethally dangerous for the correct receiver of the advice. We must note that such an advice is not the same as simply 'a good advice' in the meaning of a recommendation that is necessarily profitable for the receiver of the advice him- or herself. The mature person strives to support other men and society as a whole either directly, through his or her own acting, or indirectly, by acting as a moral advisor to others, and the person who

in a certain situation best fulfils the moral demand of supporting others and society is the person who rightly should act.

The individual interpretation of what supports other people and society is of course dependent on the cultural norms in the current society, and further all men have an individual personality and a unique life history with unique experiences which inevitably will affect the moral judgements they make. For this reason the moral judgements of different mature persons will differ. But still the moral judgements of mature men and women from different cultures will show a certain similarity, since there are some basic human needs and thus preferences which will always remain the same; above all to go on living and to engage in activities which make one's life worth living.

Chapter 2
Sympathy

UNIVERSAL SYMPATHY: AN OVERVIEW

In this work we have chosen to study the nature of five everyday expressions: morality, maturity, sympathy, autonomy, and mature judgement, as well as their semantic connections. In this chapter we will analyse the different meanings of the everyday expression of sympathy, and in the next chapter, in our discussion of the everyday expression of autonomy, we will show how these two expressions are connected to that of maturity.

We do not use the expression 'maturity' in direct connection with the expression 'sympathy' in daily language, saying that a mature person has sympathy for others or that a person with sympathy for others is mature, but still in everyday language we do use 'maturity' in a way which implies sympathy in a certain everyday meaning of the word. We will show that there is a connection between certain meanings of 'maturity' and certain meanings of 'sympathy' through the other everyday expressions which we have chosen to study, namely morality, autonomy, and mature judgement. In Chapter 3 we will show that certain of the everyday meanings of 'sympathy' cover what is needed for a morally relevant autonomy, i.e., an influence over oneself which is used for realising the aims of morality in judging and in acting, which is the way we use the expression 'maturity' in everyday language.

As we saw in the last chapter, maturity must be connected both to extroversion in the sense of being interested in others, and to unselfishness as something active, i.e.,

as taking an interest in others for their sake, with the aim of supporting these others. Extroversion and unselfishness are provided for by sympathy in a certain sense of the everyday expression, namely what we have chosen to call a universal sympathy.

In everyday language today, sympathy is used in the meaning of taking an interest in another person for one's own sake, an interest which is motivated by the striving for pleasure. Such a kind of sympathy is dependent on the agent's own preferences, what he or she likes and dislikes, and thus on the other fulfilling certain criteria like being attractive or funny. But we will also show that one of the meanings of the everyday expression of sympathy is as taking an interest in the other for his or her own sake, which is a concern for others. This means that the other, what supports him or her, i.e., what protects his or her life and what makes his or her life worth living to him or her, is important to one. Such an interest is not motivated by the striving for pleasure, and thus it is not a personal interest: it is not dependent on the agent's own preferences, what he or she likes and dislikes, and thus it is not dependent on the other fulfilling certain criteria. The other is the object of one's sympathy simply as being a fellow human being in a brotherhood of men. This also allows for sympathising with future generations of yet unborn human beings.

A sympathy of this kind is more stable than an interest motivated by the striving for pleasure: It will not easily vanish in the face of a sudden disappointment, which means that it can be continuous. And it can be universal, directed towards all men, since individual differences in looks or manners do not matter. Everyone with whom the agent comes into contact immediately becomes the object of his or her sympathy, and it is as strong towards all men. Such a universal sympathy, as we have chosen to call it in this work, can be directed towards several individuals at the same time, i.e., not only towards one single individual who is in need of help, but towards all who are involved in a certain situation, and in addition it allows for taking also society as a whole into regard for the sake of all its members. In everyday language we call this kind of sympathy too simply 'sympathy', but for matters of convenience we have chosen to call it universal sympathy in this work.

We will show that this universal sympathy consists mainly in an affirmative mental attitude and in friendly feelings, which are feelings of joy at human intercourse. And in the next chapter we will show that a universal, continuous affirmative mental atti-

tude and a continuous friendly feeling give an autonomy of a certain kind, namely one which is used for fulfilling the aims of morality, which means that a universal sympathy allows for a moral competence in judgement and in action, which means that it allows for maturity.

Before we go on to study the everyday expression of sympathy in more detail, we will have to specify the meaning of the everyday expression of feeling.

FEELINGS AND EMOTIONS

According to the way we use the expression in daily language today, a feeling consists of a feeling experience, i.e., a certain kind of mental state, an experienced and therefore conscious state of the mind of a certain duration. There are feelings as bodily sensations like physical pain, feelings as moods, being in good or being in bad mood, i.e., feeling well or unwell generally, and feelings which are casually connected to a certain thought, perception, or activity without being directed towards it, like joy at the thought of someone whom one finds funny, at the sight of a painting which one finds beautiful, or at having an interesting conversation with others. In addition there are feelings as presentiments, like in having a bad feeling that something terrible is going to happen, which is a feeling which is related to an imagined future event without being directed towards it, i.e., it is casually connected to certain beliefs.

Further there is a distinction between 'feeling' and 'emotion' in everyday language today. Emotions are feelings which are directed towards a certain human being or animal, and the classical examples are love and hatred. Emotions mostly are more intense and often of longer duration than other feelings, and they often influence the agent's mental life more strongly and over a longer period of time than other feelings do: A love experience can change one's whole life; an experience of joy hardly does. The difference in daily language between the three feeling phenomena joy, having a feeling that something good is going to happen, and love, is shown by the fact that we say that one loves someone, which is an experience of a certain duration; one does not simply love, and one does not suddenly feel love at the thought of something; whereas one does not joy someone or something, but on the other hand one

can feel joy either in general, i.e., at nothing at all: one simply feels joyful, or at something: a thought, a material object, or an activity. Having a feeling that something good is going to happen is a pleasant feeling which is dependent on a more or less conscious belief about the future. One does not 'feel' the future, or 'feel' one's belief concerning the future like one loves one's wife; one has a pleasant feeling, and this pleasant feeling is caused by, not directed towards, one's belief. This makes it clear that as distinguished from joy and from the pleasant feeling which makes up a presentiment, love as we use the expression in daily language implies a relation to an object, as a directedness towards the object, which is not caused by the love experience but instead part of the love experience itself: According to the way we use the expression 'love' in everyday language, loving someone *means* having an affective relation to a certain living object. But whereas love necessarily is directly connected to an object through its character of being a relation to something, since it cannot appear without this directedness, joy and a presentiment like a pleasant feeling as we use the expressions in daily language are only indirectly connected to an object, namely casually. The experience of joy is not directed towards for example the thought of someone whom one finds funny, the material object, e.g., the beautiful painting, or the activity, e.g. the interesting conversation, but rather caused by it and experienced simultaneously to (further) thinking, perceiving, or acting, and the same is true of the presentiment in relation to the belief that everything is going to turn out well.

The everyday use of the expression 'feeling' is distinct from the everyday use of the expressions for all other mental phenomena, like beliefs, memories, views, perceptions, wishes, and judgements. According to Steinfath in his *Orientierung am Guten. Praktisches Überlegen und die Konstitution von Personen*, the feeling is a special class of the mental due to the unique quality of the felt experience, which is a special quality of consciousness which is to be found in no other mental phenomena, neither in wishes, nor in views.[41]

According to our everyday language, the sense perception of touch is not identical with a bodily sensation like physical pain; instead, the sense perception of touch gives rise to bodily sensations. That these are distinct is shown by the fact that bodily

[41] Steinfath, *Orientierung am Guten* p. 121.

sensations are not caused by sense perceptions only; all kinds of feelings which we have mentioned can be caused by other mental phenomena like memories or beliefs. The belief that one is in danger may make one experience both fear and being cold, and feeling cold is a bodily sensation.

The meaning of the everyday expression of feeling also differs from that of mental attitude and view. According to the way we use the expression in everyday language, mental attitudes are no states but a relation of the mind, actively created by the mind itself, to itself or to something else, which takes the form of attention and concentration. In the feeling experience, on the other hand, the mind is essentially passive: Rather than actively taking a position, in the form of taking an attitude towards something or forming a view concerning something, the mind is suddenly caught up by, filled with, the feeling as an experienced state. Joy is a feeling, not a mental attitude; interest is a mental attitude, not a feeling, although it is casually connected to different feeling experiences.

Like all feelings, the emotions too, according to the way we use 'emotion' in daily language, are essentially passive, and thus they are no mental attitudes in the strict sense, although they are directed towards an object. One cannot force oneself to experience a feeling; people often exclaim that it is impossible to force oneself to love someone, for example. One can just intently influence factors that hopefully will lead one to experience a certain feeling state: One can directly, through an effort of the will, take a mental attitude, for example in forcing oneself to become interested in another person, which may raise certain feelings in one which in time may develop into the emotion which we call love. The everyday expression of love is semantically connected to the everyday expression 'attitude' in the meaning of a mental attitude towards the other, namely one of taking an interest in the other for his sake, but 'attitude' in this meaning of the word does not mean an experience, and thus no feeling experience. We will discuss this issue in more detail later.

Steinfath claims that the feelings can occupy our attention in different degrees due to the intensity of the experienced feeling states, which means that they can be more or less conscious.[42] This corresponds to the way we use the expression feeling in daily language. As experienced states of mind, the feelings always demand a certain

[42] Steinfath, *Orientierung am Guten* p. 123.

attention from the mind, therewith turning the mind's attention towards itself, which means that all feeling experiences imply a certain self-centredness. And since one always has feelings, the human mind is always to some extent self-centred. The more intense the feelings, the more the mind is occupied by these felt experiences, and the more self-centred. We will have reason to return to this fact later.

LOVE OF MAN

In everyday language, 'love' consists not only of the emotion of love, i.e., of a feeling experience; it also includes a mental attitude of taking an interest in the other for his or her sake, and other aspects as well. Steinfath rightly notes that love can appear in many forms, and in most of these, love is not only, and not even primarily, a feeling, but instead a complex pattern of feeling, thinking, wishing, and behaving.[43]

Today, 'love' is used in a multitude of ways: as feeling experiences, for example of joy and occasionally of pain, as beliefs that the other has certain qualities which one evaluates highly, depending on certain judgements made concerning the other and on one's own views concerning what is preferable, as mental attitudes, for example of interest and admiration, as (psychophysical) wishes, of wanting to be with the beloved one, and of wanting to support him or her, and even as acting: seeking the other's company, actively striving to help the other, etc. Thus when talking about love, we mean not only a feeling experience, or a feeling experience and a certain mental attitude, but a complex pattern of feelings, thoughts, judgements, beliefs, attitudes, wishes, and behaviour. These different meanings of the expression of love do not exclude each other, but instead they point to the fact that 'love' is commonly used in the meaning of a form of life, a human practice: According to the way we use the expression in daily language, one does not simply 'feel' love, one *lives* it. But this is not the way we use the expression 'emotion' in daily language: As we have noted, the feeling according to the everyday sense of the word consists of an experienced state of the mind, and the emotion is a feeling which is directed towards another living creature. The 'emotion of love' cannot mean the whole complex which we call love; no-one would in his or her semantic practice include physical action in an emo-

[43] Steinfath, *Orientierung am Guten* p. 122.

tion, for example. Thus 'emotion' must mean a certain aspect of the complex phenomenon which we call love in everyday language, namely the feeling aspect.

Sympathy in the everyday sense of the word certainly contains feeling experiences of some sort, and it is always directed towards something; one does not just 'sympathise', one always sympathises with something, with a person or with a certain political view, for example. According to our description of the everyday use of the expressions of feeling and emotion, this might make us assume that sympathy is an emotion. But this is not the way we use the expression of sympathy in everyday language: We do not speak of 'the emotion of sympathy'. Instead, sympathy means another kind of relation to another person than the emotion does, namely a relation which takes the form of actively taking sides with the other, and this is not included in the everyday meaning of emotion as a feeling which is directed towards an object. We have noted that a feeling experience is always something passive, it comes over one, one does not choose it oneself, whereas one can actively, intently, take a certain mental attitude towards something. This makes us suspect that sympathy means taking a mental attitude towards the other person, which is something much more active than just passively experiencing a feeling, whether directed towards an object or not. But we have seen that a feeling or feelings which has/have an object and a mental attitude towards something are both covered by the everyday expression of love, and this may make us assume that sympathy is simply a form of love in the everyday sense, or at least that the meaning of the everyday expression of sympathy shows interesting similarities to that of love, in which case sympathy would consist neither just in a feeling, nor in an emotion, but instead in a form of life, a human practice.

For being able to clarify the meaning of the everyday expression of sympathy, we must further specify what we mean by love in everyday language.

In *A Treatise of Human Nature*, Hume uses many different names for the feelings: 'impression', 'emotion', 'affection', 'sentiment', and 'sensation', but his central feeling expression is 'passion'. He admits that the passion cannot be defined accurately – he calls it a 'violent impression'[44] - but he claims that everyone knows what a passion is from experience and that everyone is able to form a correct conception at least of the

[44] Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature* p. 276.

passions appearing more frequently. Examples of passions are joy, suffering, love, pride, humility, shame, pity, hatred, and contempt.[45]

Hume's concept of love is very wide, and consists of tenderness, friendship, intimacy, esteem, and good-will, among other things. These are all basically the same passion, though with small variations, Hume says.[46]

Humean love is possible not only between people who have a close relation, like brothers. It is also possible between people who have never met, if they are mutually affected by the other's advantage or loss, like in the case of tradesmen who do business. Business partners who have never met are still pleased with the other's advantage and displeased with his or her disadvantage, since this is good/bad for themselves. In this case their concern for their own interest gives them pleasure because of the pleasure and pain because of the pain of the partner.

Such a concept of love clearly differs from the everyday concept of love of our time, which includes an intimacy and intensity which forms no part of the relation between business partners who do not even meet personally. We have already noted that love is always directed towards a living thing, and in love for persons we can distinguish between love of the sexes, love for one's close relatives like one's own children, and love of man. All these kinds of love imply intimacy and intensity, and the intensity contained in the love experience may even motivate one to sacrifice one's life for the other, something which we would not expect from business partners.

What interests us here is not love between the sexes or for one's close relatives, but love of man, since we are looking for a expression of sympathy with moral relevance, and this requires a sympathy which is characterised by continuity and universality. Love of man differs from love between the sexes in several ways as the expressions are used in daily language. Love of man has nothing to do with the other person's current feeling: It does not matter whether the other loves one back, whether he or she is indifferent to us, or even hates or despises us. This means that love of man has no relation at all to reciprocity: It is not strengthened by being returned, since it has as its single source the agent him- or herself. Love of man is not dependent on the

[45] Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature* pp. 276-277.
[46] ibid. p. 448.

other fulfilling certain criteria other than being a living human being, whereas erotic love is dependent on the other being in some certain way (attractive, kind, etc.). Today's everyday expression of love of man connotes a continuous feeling, thinking, and acting; it is nothing which is practised in one individual situation and then never again. And whereas erotic love is directed towards a certain person, love of man is universal: it is exhibited in one's feelings for, mental attitude towards, and way of treating all other men. And there is nothing self-centred in love of man, except of course, as in all feeling experiences, for the fact that the feeling experience included occupies part of the agent's attention. It cannot be directed towards the agent him- or herself; although there can be love for oneself, what we call self-love in everyday language, there can be no love of man for oneself; and it cannot be restricted to certain individuals: There is no love of man for one's close relatives only.

Now we have outlined the meaning of the everyday expression of love of man today: It is continuous, universal, and characterised by intimacy and intensity in the feeling experiences, and it may motivate to self-sacrifice. This makes it obvious that sympathy in the everyday sense of the word must be something different from love of man: as we use the expression of sympathy in daily language, it is often neither universal nor continuous, since we tend to sympathise with individual persons in individual cases, and it is characterised neither by intimacy, since we may well sympathise with people whom we do not know well, nor by intensity, since sympathy, as distinguished from love of man, is used for human relations which allow for, perhaps even necessitate, a considerable distance socially and emotionally. And for these reasons it is questionable whether sympathy as we use the expression in daily language can motivate to self-sacrifice.

By now we have reason to assume that not only love, but also sympathy consists in a form of life rather than just in a certain feeling or feelings, but that it consists in another form of life than love does, one which lacks the intimacy and intensity of love of man, and one which is not necessarily continuous and universal. 'Sympathy' is used as meaning pleasant feeling experiences, above all of joy at human intercourse, as beliefs, that the other has certain qualities which one evaluates as being good, depending on certain judgements made concerning the other and on views of what is preferable, further as a mental attitude of being affirmatively disposed towards the

other, as wishes, to share the other's company and to support the other, as external attitudes, i.e., body language, and as acting: seeking the other's company and actively striving to help the other. This means that like that of love, the everyday expression of sympathy connotes a complex pattern of feelings, thoughts, judgements, beliefs, attitudes, wishes, and behaviour, of which several join in a certain human practice, a form of life, whereas others join in another form of life, due to their different meanings. In this chapter we will concentrate on two aspects of sympathy which are especially relevant for our purposes, namely mental attitude and feeling.

We will further clarify the nature of the everyday expression of sympathy today by referring to Hume's concept of sympathy.

HUME AND SYMPATHY TODAY

Hume defines sympathy as the process of transforming an 'idea', i.e., a conception, into an impression, which as we have seen is one of his feeling terms.[47] By using our imagination, we form a conception of the other's current passion, or of his or her character, or one based on a perception of his or her action, or on reflections on the tendency of the other's character or passion to the happiness of mankind and of particular persons. This conception is pleasurable or painful to us, and this pleasure or pain gives rise to certain passions in us. For example, another person's pleasure and that in him which is agreeable, i.e., pleasant, to us, namely a certain quality, both make us love him. We sympathise with a person's pleasure for example because of his wealth and power. Through sympathy we can experience all the passions of others. In sympathy there is nothing which fixes one's attention on oneself: Our own person is not the object of any passion, and our personal interest is not concerned.

Sympathising only with pain is a limited sympathy: Complete sympathy, what Hume calls 'extensive sympathy' requires being sensible to the other's good *and* bad fortune.[48] According to Hume, benevolence, which is a desire for the happiness of another person, and an aversion to his misery, arises when a person's happiness or misery is dependent on the happiness or misery on another person. This must mean

[47] Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature* p. 317.
[48] ibid. p. 386.

that one's benevolence is dependent on one's sympathy. Hume further defines pity in the same way as he defines benevolence.[49] And he says that we sympathise also with what we imagine to be a person's future passion, and by using our imagination, we sympathise with the passions of people who are not 'in being'.[50]

But this is not the way we use the expression sympathy in daily language today. Sympathy in the everyday sense of the word does not consist in the process of transforming a conception into a feeling experience; not even as transforming a conception of the other being attractive, funny, interesting, or nice into a feeling of pleasure.

Humean benevolence resembles the way we use the expression fellow-feeling in everyday language today, namely as fellow-joy and as fellow-suffering, i.e., pity, although today we do not use the expressions pity and fellow-joy in the meaning of a wish, what Hume calls a desire, but rather as a feeling experience which is casually connected to wishes. Today we do not use the expression 'sympathy' in direct connection with 'fellow-feeling', neither as meaning fellow-joy, nor as pity. Hume's example of a case of sympathy, namely from watching a shipwreck, shows the difference between his concept of sympathy and that of today's everyday language:

> Suppose I am now in safety at land, and wou'd willingly reap some pleasure from this consideration: I must think on the miserable condition of those who are at sea in a storm, and must endeavour to render this idea as strong and lively as possible, in order to make me more sensible of my own happiness. But whatever pains I may take, the comparison will never have an equal efficacy, as if I were really on the shore, and saw a ship at a distance, tost by a tempest, and in danger every moment of perishing on a rock or a sand-bank. But suppose this idea to become still more lively. Suppose the ship to be driven so near me, that I can perceive distinctly the horror, painted on the countenance of the seamen and passengers, hear their lamentable cries, see the dearest friends give their last adieu, or embrace with a resolution to perish in each other's arms: No man has so savage a heart as to reap any pleasure from such a spectacle, or withstand the motions of the tenderest compassion and sympathy.[51]

[49] Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature* p. 382.
[50] ibid. pp. 385.
[51] ibid. p. 594.

Today we would not say that watching a shipwreck would inspire to sympathy with the crew and passengers; instead, we would say that it would give us a shock and give rise to fear for the lives of those aboard, and possibly to pity with their suffering. Pity, according to the way we use the expression today, as suffering because of another person's suffering, is a reactive feeling, i.e., an emotional reaction to the way one imagines another's suffering.

Certainly we also sympathise with people who suffer, but still this means something else than pitying them. We do not, as in Hume, sympathise with others' feelings. If a person is suffering, one does not sympathise with his or her suffering, which makes one pity him or her, i.e., imagining his or her suffering and transforming this picture into a feeling experience. Instead, one sympathises with the person, taking sides with him or her, which takes the form of an attitude of affirmation and of experiencing certain pleasant feelings in the intercourse with him or her.

According to the way we use the expressions today, pity has quite another intensity than the feelings included in sympathy. Sympathy may make it easier for one to experience fellow-joy or pity for the person: When pitying, our affirmative attitude of sympathy remains, but our feelings change from pleasant ones, above all of joy, into feelings of suffering. Our sympathy is thus changed into pity. But sympathy is not a necessary requirement for being able to pity someone, since we may well pity people with whom we do not sympathise, i.e., with whom we do not take sides as a willingness to enter into some kind of partner relation because liking them personally, and the fact that we sympathise with a person does not mean that we will necessarily pity him in a situation where we have reason to suspect that he is suffering. Sympathy and pity, as containing opposite feelings, namely of joy and of pain respectively, cannot exist together: Pity, being such an intensive feeling, when it appears always replaces one's sympathy. One cannot be joyful, which is part of what it means to sympathise with someone, and at the same time pity someone, since pitying means suffering with someone. Either there is pity without sympathy preceding it, or there is sympathy which does not vanish, even at the sight of suffering, or there is sympathy which is replaced by pity, or one's sympathy for the person vanishes without being replaced by pity.

Neither is sympathy directly connected to fellow-joy. Whereas fellow-joy, like pity, is a reactive feeling, as joy because of the joy of another, sympathy is not necessarily reactive, and in most cases it is not. Sympathy connotes taking sides with someone, and thereby confirming one's willingness to a partnership, either as colleagues or as friends. One can take sides with another person because one finds him or her intellectually interesting or physically attractive, or because one judges his or her action to be morally good, and in all these cases one's sympathy for the other has no relation to the other's current feeling. Fellow-feeling, as fellow-joy and as pity, does not mean confirming one's willingness to a partnership, either as colleagues or as friends or whatever, by taking sides with someone; it just means to feel. This means that sympathy today has no direct relation to joy or to suffering in the other.

In Humean sympathy, our own person is not the object of any passion, and there is nothing which fixes our attention on ourselves.[52] Likewise, sympathy in the everyday sense today is exclusively directed towards others: One cannot sympathise with oneself. Sympathy as we use the expression in daily language must have an object which is not identical with the agent himself. Thus sympathy means a relation to another person, through the mental attitude included, which may facilitate fellow-feeling, but which is still distinct from fellow-feeling.

Humean sympathy is a sympathy also with those who are dead[53], and today we would say that as we may love or hate or pity or even fear those who are already dead, likewise we can sympathise with them. We sympathise with people from the past whose ideas we evaluate positively, and we can also sympathise with the persons themselves, if we believe them to have been helpful to others in their lifetime, for example. For Hume, complete sympathy requires sympathising not only with what one imagines to be a person's present passion, but also what one imagines to be his or her future passion. Today we would not say that we sympathise with a person's future state, as consisting of feelings or whatever, since we do not sympathise with his or her state at all, but with him- or herself, and we would not say that right now we sympathise not only with the person now but also with him or her in the

[52] Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature* p. 340.
[53] ibid. p. 371.

future. On the other hand we may say that we sympathise with future generations of people not yet born, for example in a discussion of current environmental problems.

'SYMPATHISING' AND 'BEING SYMPATHETIC'

Our discussion of Humean sympathy has made it clear that according to the way we use the expression of sympathy today we do not sympathise with feelings. Instead, we sympathise with individual persons, with groups of persons, like for example with all those who make a serious effort to live healthily so as not to be a burden to the social system, with organisations like a political party, with ideologies, and with theoretical conceptions of value. For our purposes, namely to show how the everyday expression of maturity is connected to that of morality, what is of interest is not sympathy with certain social groups, organisations, ideologies or ideals, but sympathy with individual persons, and as we will see, ultimately with all other individuals, and this makes one take also society as a whole into regard for the sake of all its members.

In everyday language we say that one 'feels sympathy' for another person, and that one 'shows' another person sympathy, but we also say that a person is 'sympathetic'. According to the way we use the expression, that someone is sympathetic is a judgement about that person's appearance and behaviour. 'Appearance' means a person's external attitude, which takes the form of body language: pose, facial expressions, gaze, tone of voice, and bodily movements. 'Being sympathetic' means appearing and behaving in a way which the person judging finds friendly, which means being polite and helpful in a way which the judge finds pleasant. Judging someone as being sympathetic in this sense indicates that one imagines that this person has a friendly appearance most of the time and that he or she behaves friendly not only towards oneself right at the moment, but towards all or most other people over a longer period of time, which means that 'being sympathetic' connotes a certain habit of appearing in certain ways to others and of treating others in certain ways. This points to a continuity and universality in the meaning of the expression.

But rather than saying that the sympathetic person him- or herself feels sympathy or shows sympathy, we would say that the person who is judging another as being

sympathetic probably feels – and possibly shows - sympathy, namely for the person whom he or she judges as being sympathetic, which means that he or she is sympathising with that other person. Thus whereas 'being sympathetic' is a quality which someone attributes to another person because of the way he or she interprets that person's appearance and behaviour, which shows that it is a third person perspective, 'sympathising' connotes one's own behaviour towards others, as a first person perspective: Whereas one would hardly call oneself 'sympathetic', one may well say that one sympathises with someone.

The person whom one judged as being sympathetic because he or she treated one in a way which one found friendly might be a civil servant doing his or her job correctly, which includes treating others politely and helpfully. Likewise, sympathy for someone is exhibited in friendly appearance and in friendly behaviour, i.e., as being polite and helpful.

'Sympathetic' thus is a judgement of someone simply as appearing and as behaving in certain ways. It does not require of that person that he or she take a certain mental attitude towards others, and neither does it require having any special feelings. We do not expect from the civil servant that he or she shall like us personally, experiencing joy and other pleasant feelings in our company, in the way our friends do. Sympathising with someone on the other hand, according to the way we use the expression in daily language, cannot be reduced to appearance and behaviour, to just playing a social role successfully by wearing a mask of friendliness through being polite and helpful, without taking any real interest in the other and without experiencing certain feelings. Sympathising with someone means a much more active form of engagement than just politely and helpfully doing one's job to avoid complaints from one's senior officials, like in the case of the civil servant. Sympathising with someone includes taking an interest in the person which is not just an interest in the other as a client in a business relation, for example; it means taking an interest in the other on personal grounds. For this reason, sympathising with someone implies some sort of personal relation on the part of the person sympathising towards the other, but not necessarily one of reciprocity, as we will see later.

The fact that sympathising includes taking a personal interest in the other makes sympathising fragile, as distinguished from being sympathetic. Whereas the compe-

tent civil servant or businessman/businesswoman will not change his or her appearance and behaviour even if he or she becomes disappointed with the other's behaviour, since being sympathetic is part of his or her task, sympathising, being much more personal, can well be punctual: One can well sympathise with someone at one moment and not at the next, because of a sudden disappointment, which indicates that sympathising must not take the form of a habit of treating all or most people friendly.

On the other hand, sympathising with someone does not require personal intercourse: One may well establish a personal relation of some kind to a person whom one has never met, whom one knows only from hearsay, but of whom one has received a good impression, simply by liking him or her, which is quite another relation than that of the civil servant or of the businessman/businesswoman to his or her client.

We sympathise with others because they fulfil certain criteria which we judge to be good. For example, we sympathise with persons who share our own views, e.g. political or moral or aesthetic, and with persons who act in a way which we approve of, for example in being helpful to others. We may sympathise with people whom we judge as being honest, brave, or just, for example, which are qualities which are thought to be of use to others. But often we sympathise with others because there is something which we hope to receive from them. Thus one may sympathise with another person who is helpful to a third part because one hopes to receive help oneself. And it is not at all the case that we always sympathise with someone whose views and/or acting correspond to morality. People tend to sympathise with different things due to their personal taste, and not all of these things are useful to individuals or to society. We tend to sympathise with people whom we find physically attractive, nice, funny, intellectually interesting, etc., since these are qualities which we approve of, for which reason we receive pleasure from the intercourse with these persons. Such a sympathy is dependent on one's expectation to receive further pleasure from the other by spending more time with him or her: We are affirmatively disposed towards the other only as long as we believe that we can gain any pleasure from him or her, and we like a person more who gives us more pleasure. And for this reason, often people's sympathy for others is not of long duration: When one feels bored or

irritated or disappointed by the other, one's sympathy easily vanishes, since one does not expect to receive any more pleasure from him or her. This means that people often sympathise with a person in a certain situation but not in the next.

For Hume, similarity in character or manners as well as a relation through country, family, or work, or mere acquaintance, facilitate our sympathy.[54] Similarity gives rise to approbation and therewith to pleasure, and pleasure gives rise to love, and relation or acquaintance produces love through the intimacy included. We naturally love our close relatives more than remote relatives, and strangers even less, and the closer the relation to the object, the more easily the conception of the other's passion is converted into a passion of our own. Further Hume claims that through our sympathy for others, we are influenced not only by what we imagine to be other persons' passions, but also by their opinions, including their views concerning good and evil. People's sympathy for each other gives rise to a uniformity in the mentality of those belonging to a certain nation.[55] Concerning the propensity to sympathise with others and to receive their inclinations and sentiments, Hume says:

> This is not only conspicuous in children, who implicitly embrace every opinion propos'd to them; but also in men of the greatest judgment and understanding, who find it very difficult to follow their own reason or inclination, in opposition to that of their friends and daily companions.[56]

Hume's claim that similarity in characters and relation in the form of nationality, family, work, or mere acquaintance facilitates our sympathy is true also of a sympathy which is dependent on pleasure received from the other. Like Humean sympathy, such a sympathy dependent on pleasure decreases with increasing distance; it is easier to sympathise with people whom we meet personally than with persons whom we know only through hearing, for the simple reason that we more easily receive pleasure from persons with whom we have direct intercourse. Further Hume's claim that sympathy makes the agent take the other's position, assuming his or her perspective, and therewith become influenced by his or her views, including his or

[54] Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature* p. 318.
[55] ibid. p. 316.
[56] ibid. p. 316.

her views concerning moral good and evil, is true also of a sympathy dependent on pleasure received.

A sympathy of this kind makes one concentrate solely on the persons with whom one sympathises, which makes it impossible to take others into consideration when making a moral judgement. Further the fact that sympathy of this kind easily makes one influenced by the other's views destroys one's capacity for critically judging the views of those with whom one sympathises. A moral judgement which is based on a sympathy of this kind only says that those with whom one sympathises are to be supported or defended, which means that it must be a bad moral judgement. Consequently sympathy of such a kind is a threat to the person's moral competence, since it makes partial.

Sympathy with non-moral qualities like physical attraction or wittiness, or even with human weakness like laziness, i.e., with lack of energy, and in addition even with anti-moral qualities, i.e., with immoral ones like a child-like egoism, because the interpretation of the other as possessing such qualities gives us pleasure, is sympathy as a purely non-moral expression. This does not mean that we use the expression of sympathy in a negative (reprehensible) sense in daily language, that we consider it *immoral*. Not everything which is not moral is immoral; although in the *Nicomachean Ethics*, Aristotle does not distinguish between morality and etiquette: Wittiness and tactfulness, joined in ευτραπελια, are part of morality, which means that a man who is not able to entertain, amuse, others in a pleasant way is immoral; still today various kinds of behaviour are no matter for morality, namely behaviour which concerns giving a good, i.e. pleasant impression, like telling good jokes, behaving well at table, dressing well or moving and speaking elegantly, what we call etiquette. This kind of behaviour is commonly used in a non-moral sense, as being socially relevant but nevertheless as being morally irrelevant: Unlike Aristotle, we would not call a person who does not know how to behave well at table 'immoral'.

A sympathy which is based on the striving for pleasure makes people socialise: People meet with the aim of having a good time and of pursuing their interests, and they do this for their own sake, and this is done out of a sympathy with others which is neither moral nor immoral.

We will now argue that the description of sympathy given above was premature, and that the everyday expression of sympathy is also used in a way which connects it to the everyday expression of morality, which makes it highly relevant in a discussion of maturity and its moral relevance. This requires that we clarify the meanings of the two most relevant aspects of sympathy, namely mental attitude and feeling.

AFFIRMATIVE MENTAL ATTITUDE

We have noted that according to the way we use the expression in everyday language, mental attitudes are no states but a directedness of the mind, actively created by the mind itself, to itself or to something else. Mental attitudes are always directed towards something, which means that they always have an object. This directedness takes the form of attention to and concentration on the object.

We receive thousands of stimuli in a single moment, but only a few are relevant as a source of information for living according to morality. We cannot absorb everything, and we have to concentrate on what is essential. My hunger or thirst, my tiredness, my irritation and fascination in other things, my memories of the past and expectations concerning the near future, colours and lights which are not connected to the problem at hand, pain, etc., nothing is allowed to disturb my morally relevant perception of a situation.

In everyday language, 'attention' means a general preparedness or readiness to be sensitive to stimuli; it means that the mind is open to the context in which the object is to be found, and thus to relations of the object to other objects. But our attentiveness to ourselves and to our fellow-men must be regulated by concentration to become effective. In everyday language, concentration means sorting out and choosing some aspects of reality as worthy of our attention, and focusing one's mind on these, which makes one receptive to stimuli from the objects of one's concentration and not from other objects. Thus a concentrated and at the same time attentive mind observes the object as well as the context.

We have also noted that taking a mental attitude towards something is something much more active than just passively experiencing a feeling; one can directly, through an effort of the will, take a mental attitude, for example in forcing oneself to

become interested in another person. According to the everyday use of the expressions of feeling and mental attitude today, attitudes are more durable dispositions than feelings. We take an interest in something over a longer period of time, but we feel joy only during a short moment.

Whereas the feeling, according to the way we use the expression in daily language, is an experienced state, the mental attitude is a relation, and according to the way we use the expression 'relation' in connection with the expression 'attitude' in the meaning of a mental attitude, one does not experience a relation. According to the everyday meaning of 'attitude' as meaning mental attitude and of 'experience', one does not experience a mental attitude in the meaning of the mind being directed towards an object; instead, certain experiences are made possible through this directedness of the mind, or more exactly, through our perception of the object towards which the mental attitude is directed. The everyday expression 'mental attitude' implies the expressions 'concentration' and 'attention', and according to the way we use these expressions, one can be aware of one's concentration and attention, by which one may conclude that one has taken a certain attitude as meaning a mental attitude. In addition one experiences feeling states, according to the meaning of the expression 'feeling state' in everyday language, and 'feeling state' and 'attitude' in the meaning of a mental attitude imply each other semantically, that is, depending on their meanings, certain feelings imply certain mental attitudes and the other way round. The way we use the expression 'being interested' implies for example the expression 'feeling excited'. But this does not mean that 'being interested' itself means an experience; instead, it implies 'feeling excited' (among other things), which means experiencing something. Further, the meaning of the everyday expression of attitude in the meaning of a mental attitude differs from that of 'wish' in that wishing means wanting something, it means an exercise of one's will, an individual act of willing, whereas a mental attitude is a relation, a directedness of the mind towards an object, in attention and concentration.

Hume's notes on pride in *A Treatise of Human Nature* will help clarifying the nature of the mental attitude included in sympathy, by showing what it is not. For Hume, whereas the object of love is another person, the object of pride is oneself. Pride is pleasant, and except for oneself, the object of pride is also what gives one pleasure,

and these two things are closely connected: Pride is a satisfaction with oneself arising form the perception of one's own good qualities or one's external goods. An object which excites pride is always considered with a view to oneself: One is proud only of something which is related to oneself, like one's beautiful house, not of beauty as such. Therewith pride turns one's attention towards one's self, making one think of one's own qualities and circumstances.[57]

As distinguished from Humean pride, the mental attitude included in sympathy is not directed towards oneself, but only towards others: As we noted in the section on Humean sympathy, one cannot sympathise with oneself. And since we are here interested in mental attitude as part of what we mean by a sympathy which is connected to a morally relevant maturity in the everyday sense, taking a mental attitude here means that the mind is directed towards individuals, not towards things like political movements, political ideologies, or conceptions of value.

Taking a mental attitude towards someone means creating a certain kind of relation to the other, and usually this relation is qualitative, i.e., it means being well or ill, favourably or unfavourably disposed towards the person, which means that mental attitudes are mostly pro or con, although they can be neutral. One example of being well, favourably, disposed towards another person is the mental attitude which we call interest. Interest in the external world is a directedness of the mind towards something else than itself. One is not interested in general, one is interested in something, and interest is directedness towards objects which have been, which are, and which may become objects of one's perception. One is almost always interested in something, and one is interested in various things, but one's interest always takes the form of concentration and attention. Taking an interest in someone means taking a mental attitude of affirmation of the object of one's interest, of an affirmative acceptance of the object as being something which deserves one's attention and concentration.

We may clarify the meaning of the everyday expression of interest by comparing it with that of curiosity. As distinguished from interest, curiosity as we use the expression in daily language is not directed towards what is relevant. It is momentary and may easily vanish. Curiosity implies self-centredness, which interest as such does

[57] Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature* pp. 277, 285, 290, 297, 330.

not, since curiosity is the striving for acquisition of knowledge for one's own sake, to satisfy one's own intellectual needs. Interest on the other hand must not necessarily aim at the mere acquisition of knowledge. Instead it can be part of a wider pattern of understanding the world for the sake of fulfilling the demands of morality. This is the case in interest in others for their sake. Such an interest is not motivated by personal wishes, which means that it is not self-centred.

The meanings of the everyday expressions of experiencing pleasant feelings, of taking sides with someone, and of forming a favourable conception of someone are connected. Sympathy includes joy at human intercourse, which means experiencing certain pleasant feelings in the person's company or at the thought of him or her. This motivates to taking a certain mental attitude towards the person, which not only consists in taking an interest in him or her, but furthermore in taking sides with the person, thereby confirming a willingness to enter into a partnership of some kind, as colleagues, or, more personal, as friends. Further the pleasant feeling which we call joy motivates to forming a favourable conception of the person through making certain favourable judgements of him or her as being 'nice' or 'friendly', for example. On the other hand, according to the way we use the expression 'interest' in daily language, although as being a mental attitude it is not itself a feeling, it is still connected to some form of tension, which gives an impulse, a feeling of energy and stimulation. One feels wakeful, delighted, exhilarated, excited and/or intrigued, perhaps expectant, and joyful. Thus, according to our everyday use of the expressions, the mental attitude of interest gives a feeling of pleasure and thus of joy. This is what it means to 'feel interested'. This means that the everyday expressions of attitude in the meaning of an affirmative mental attitude and of the feeling of joy are semantically connected and that they mutually imply each other.

All this together, experiencing joy at the intercourse with the other, taking an affirmative mental attitude towards him or her and forming a conception of him or her as being good in some way, is what we mean by 'liking' a person. The everyday expression of sympathy means liking another person in this sense, which means that sympathy as we use the expression in daily language includes both a feeling and a mental attitude, among other things.

The fact that the meaning of the everyday expression of sympathy corresponds to that of liking someone becomes clearer if we compare the meaning of liking someone to that of admiring someone. Like liking someone, admiration for someone too is made up by a complex of pleasant feeling, affirmative mental attitude, and the conception of someone as being in some way good. But whereas 'admiration' in the everyday sense of the word means experiencing very strong/intensive feelings at the intercourse with the other, focusing completely on the other person whom one admires, and forming a conception of the other as being in some sense extraordinary good, as being exemplary, liking someone just implies a certain joy at the intercourse or thought of the other, taking an interest in and taking sides with the other, and forming a view of the other as being good, often in a rather trivial sense – as we have noted, for example as being 'nice'. The meaning of sympathy in everyday language clearly comes closer to the meaning of liking someone than to admiring someone: The feeling included in sympathy is less intensive than that of admiration, the mental attitude in sympathy is less strongly affirmative, and the judgement concerning the other is more modest. This makes it clear that the meaning of the everyday expression of sympathy corresponds to the meaning of the everyday expression of liking someone, and thus by explaining the meaning of the everyday expression of liking someone we have also explained the meaning of the everyday expression of sympathy.

FRIENDLY FEELING

As we have noted, sympathising with someone includes 'feeling sympathy' for the person. With 'showing someone sympathy' we associate a friendly appearance (body language) and friendly behaviour, being 'nice' and helpful, for example. Consequently we may assume that the feeling included in sympathy is what we would call a 'friendly feeling'.

Today, the 'friendly feeling' is the kind of feeling which friends tend to have for each other, which means quite another thing than what is meant by love of man in daily language. We do not say that one 'loves' a friend; a person who feels very

strongly-intensively for his or her friend does not experience a friendly feeling, but instead the emotion of love, which must not be of an erotic kind.

We have noted that our everyday use of the expression interest is connected to our everyday use of the expression joy, namely at human intercourse: A person who takes an interest in others experiences joy in their company, and joy at human intercourse is what we mean with a friendly feeling. This implies that the meanings of the expressions 'attitude' in the meaning of affirmative mental attitude and 'friendly feeling' are connected; the expression 'affirmative mental attitude' implies the expression 'friendly feeling', and, due to their meanings, having a friendly feeling implies that the mind is directed towards something in a mental attitude of affirmation.

Aristotle does not distinguish between friendship and love. φιλια includes all kinds of affection between human beings: parental love, erotic love, and friendship. (Aristotle does not discuss what today we would call love of man.) The affection contained in φιλια, both as love and as friendship, implies intimacy, which requires reciprocity, i.e., affection in both partners, based on mutual acquaintance and liking each other. Thus it cannot be practised towards people one has never met. And there is no φιλια, i.e., neither love nor friendship, for inanimate objects, because if there were, then our affection could not be returned, and we could not wish for the good of the object. A φιλια which is not based on utility, i.e., on hopes for gaining something from the other, nor on direct pleasure from the human intercourse itself, and which is not of an erotic kind, but which is based on moral goodness, takes some time to develop, since getting to know a person and acquiring the intimacy needed takes some time.[58]

Certainly today the everyday expression 'friendship' too implies a certain intimacy, but the expression 'friendly feeling' does not imply the expression 'friendship'. Whereas 'friendship' implies 'reciprocity', 'friendly feeling' does not: According to the way we use the expression of friendly feeling in everyday language, one can well like another person and enjoy his or her company without the other returning one's friendly feeling. As distinguished from fellow-joy, it has no direct connection to the other person's feelings; it is not dependent on the way the agent interprets the feelings of others, and it is well possible without the other person experiencing any kind

[58] Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 1155a16-1156b26.

of feeling or taking any mental attitude towards us at all, and without the other showing any special body language; in fact the other must not even be conscious of us, and it does not require knowing much about the other. For this reason, the friendly feeling does not imply intimacy.

But there is also Aristotelian φιλια of an incomplete while undeveloped kind, since, if at all mutual, it is not recognised by both parties. This Aristotle calls goodwill (ευνοια).[59] According to the way we use the expression of friendly feeling today, it seems to come closer to the meaning of this concept of goodwill. Aristotelian goodwill consists of an affection which, like today's friendly feeling, is without intensity. Like this kind of affection, which is spontaneous and sudden, today's friendly feeling too can be spontaneous and sudden, as when one immediately starts liking someone because of a good impression received. Unlike Aristotelian friendship, Aristotelian goodwill does not allow for reciprocity, i.e., if two persons have the feeling of goodwill towards each other, then this is not known to them. Aristotelian goodwill can be practised towards people one has never met; it is enough that one believes the other to be good or helpful. Whereas, as we have seen, sympathy can be based on the hope for receiving pleasure from the other, Aristotelian goodwill cannot be based on hopes for personal advantage, because then the object of one's 'goodwill' is oneself. It is never aroused by utility or pleasure, and it is without 'desire', Aristotle says.[60]

Although today the friendly feeling does not require reciprocity, it does not exclude it: Certainly two persons may well have friendly feelings towards each other. And if we have reason to assume that the other enjoys our company, that it makes him or her feel joy because of the pleasure it gives him, then this gives us an additional pleasure and thus joy, according to the meaning and thus implications of the everyday expression of joy. In this sense our pleasure corresponds to his or her pleasure and our joy to his or her joy. But this is by no means necessary for sympathy in the everyday sense, and if it happens, then it rather strengthens the sympathy we already have for the other.

As we noted in the section on feelings and emotions, all feeling experiences make the mind self-centred to some extent, but because of its lack of intensity, the feeling

[59] Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 1155b32-34.
[60] ibid. 1166b31-1167a14.

included in sympathy does not mean such a high degree of self-centredness as love of man does. Further the friendly feeling can, but must not necessarily, be a result of the belief that one can gain pleasure from the other. If it is the result of such a belief, then it makes especially self-centred; if not, then the friendly feeling, since it is not compatible with feelings like fear, anger, or disgust, and since one always has feelings of some sort, may well represent the lowest degree of self-centredness possible in a human mind.

Our comparison with the Aristotelian concepts of friendship and goodwill has made it clear that the friendly feeling lacks intensity, that it does not require reciprocity, but that it does not exclude it; that it does not require intimacy, and thus that it does not require much knowledge about the other. It can be spontaneous and sudden, and it can be experienced towards strangers. It is not dependent on the other fulfilling certain criteria, neither moral nor non-moral, and it is not necessarily motivated by self-centred psychophysical wishes and expectations of pleasure, nor by the expectation that the other can be useful to oneself. This means that the friendly feeling must not necessarily be punctual, experienced only in certain situations; it can also be continuous and universal, as joy at the intercourse with or thought of others simply as human beings.

Since the friendly feeling is no intensive feeling, it is no hindrance to critical reflection and to prudence. Although one likes one's friend and experiences joy at the intercourse with him or her, one is still not as emotionally involved with him or her that one cannot deliberate on his or her faults, as well as on what is good for oneself.

UNIVERSAL SYMPATHY

After having clarified the mental attitude and the feeling included in sympathy, we will now examine a meaning of sympathy according to which sympathy is not motivated by the striving for pleasure.

Neither Humean sympathy, nor a sympathy motivated by the striving for pleasure are continuous, nor are they universal: They are both directed towards persons who in one's own judgement deserve one's sympathy. This means that both are punctual, i.e., they are activated in certain cases only, and they are more easily activated if the

other person fulfils certain criteria; in Humean sympathy above all strong suffering, in sympathy in the everyday sense of the word today what pleases the agent. But the fact that according to the meaning of 'sympathy' today, one can sympathise with people whom one knows only from hearsay, i.e., with people whom one has never met, for example because one hears that they do good to others, and with people who are already dead, for example because one hears that they did good to others during their lifetime, points to the fact that there is what we have chosen to call a universal sympathy, directed towards all men, which is not motivated by the striving for pleasure.

Except for feelings, Aristotelian friendship and goodwill as they are presented in the *Nicomachean Ethics* both contain an attitude of being well-adopted towards another person, of wishing for his or her well-being for his or her own sake. We have reason to assume that we use the everyday expression of sympathy too in this sense, i.e., that – on occasion - we sympathise with the other not for our own sake but for his or her sake, and if this is true, then it makes the everyday expression of sympathy relevant in a discussion of the connection between the everyday expressions of maturity and of morality.

A sympathy motivated by the striving for pleasure means taking a personal interest in the other for one's own sake, which means that it is dependent on the agent's own preferences, what he or she likes and dislikes. This means creating a personal relation to the other, even if this relation is only from the agent to the other, i.e., one's interest is not returned. Such a personal interest motivated by one's own striving for pleasure will easily vanish in the face of a disappointment, if the other does not fulfil one's criteria. But the everyday expression of sympathy is also used in the meaning of taking an interest in the other for his or her own sake, which is a concern for others. This means that the other, what supports him or her and makes his or her life worth living to him or her, is important to one. Such an interest is not motivated by the striving for pleasure, and thus it is not a personal interest: it is not dependent on the agent's own preferences, what he or she likes and dislikes, and thus it is not dependent on the other fulfilling certain criteria like being beautiful or funny. In this sense it is not personal: It does not take the form of a personal relation to the other, neither as friends, nor as colleagues, nor as allies.

Unlike Humean sympathy which is influenced by similarity and personal relation, and which decreases with increasing distance in space, what we have chosen to call a universal sympathy is influenced neither by similarity between the agent and the other person, nor by some kind of personal relation, and it does not decrease with increasing distance in space. The other is the object of one's sympathy simply as being a fellow human being in a brotherhood of men. This also allows for sympathising with future generations of yet unborn human beings.

A sympathy of this kind, which is not motivated by the striving for pleasure and which thus is not dependent on the other fulfilling certain criteria, is more stable than an interest motivated by the striving for pleasure: It will not easily vanish in the face of a sudden disappointment, which means that it can be continuous. It can also be universal, directed towards all men, since individual differences in looks or manners do not matter. Everyone with whom the agent comes into contact immediately becomes the object of his sympathy, and it is as strong towards all men.

A sympathy which is not dependent on the striving for pleasure comes closer to the meaning of the everyday expression of love of man, but without its intensity in feeling, and without its exclusive focusing on one single individual at a time. Unlike Humean sympathy and love of man in the everyday sense today, a universal sympathy, as we have chosen to call it, is no focusing of all one's attention on anyone, as a concentration excluding attention to others. Although according to the way we use the expression in everyday language, love of man is universal in the sense of being directed towards all individuals, where no-one is excluded, it is not necessarily directed towards more than one individual at a time, and it means a complete concentration on human beings and their present condition, which does not allow for taking also what is good or necessary for the survival of all individuals into regard, namely the stability and continuity of society. Sympathy on the other hand can be directed towards several individuals at the same time, i.e., not only towards one single individual who is in need of help, but towards all who are involved in a certain situation, and in addition it allows for taking also society as a whole into regard for the sake of all its members, which makes the everyday expression of sympathy morally more relevant than the everyday expression of love of man.

Further a universal sympathy does not make the agent take the other's position, assuming his or her perspective, and therewith becoming influenced by his or her views. Such an influence requires a sympathy which is directed towards a certain person or a certain group only, which advocates a certain view or views. One cannot assume the perspective of everyone, since the perspectives of different people collide, which implies that a universal sympathy, which is directed towards everyone, would not be possible if it influenced the agent to take on the views of all other men. This indicates that a universal sympathy must exclude being influenced by the opinions of others.

For these reasons, a sympathy which is not motivated by the striving for pleasure is connected to morality as the expression is used in everyday language, and this makes the everyday expression of sympathy relevant in our study of the everyday expression of maturity.

In *A Treatise of Human Nature*, Hume speaks of restricting one's selfish passions by wilfully changing their direction: Although we cannot change our feelings, we can change their direction. At first this is done for self-interested reasons: We all have an interest in restraining our selfish feelings, since this preserves society. This self-restriction out of selfish reasons is by itself replaced by a genuine disinterestedness: What supports society now pleases us, and what threatens it displeases us, and we are now pleased by a character which is fitted to be useful to others or to the person him- or herself or which is agreeable to others or to the person him- or herself, even if this does not support us personally.[61]

Similary to Hume, we may well imagine a habituation not only of appearance and of behaviour, but also of mental attitude, and therewith of feeling. A sympathy motivated by the striving for pleasure can change into a sympathy which is not motivated by the striving for pleasure. Sympathy as mental attitude and as feeling can be trained to become continuous and universal, as a natural part of the person's mental constitution. This is done by wilfully taking a mental attitude of interest in all other human beings for their sake, which means that it is universal, directed towards all men in all situations. This will raise the corresponding joy at the intercourse with and

[61] Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature* pp. 492, 517, 533, 591.

thought of all one's fellow-men. With the time, keeping one's affirmative mental attitude no longer demands any effort of will.

SYMPATHY AND MATURITY

In the everyday sense of the word, 'maturity' means the capacity to live according to morality, which requires being able to make moral judgements which when they are acted on realise the aims of morality in the everyday sense of the word. Morality in the everyday sense demands the support of all other members of society, which requires taking all men into consideration when making a moral judgement. Taking an affirming attitude of interest in other people for their sake, and experiencing certain feelings towards others, feelings which we call friendly, makes the life of these others and the fact that their lives are worth living to them important to one. This is a presupposition for wanting to live morally, and wanting to live morally is needed for being able to live morally, to fulfil the demands of morality. Sympathy motivates to wishing to support other people, which means supporting the realisation of the aims of morality. This motivates to making mature judgements and to act on them.

Further the affirmative mental attitude included in universal sympathy means concentrating on the relevant aspects of reality, what is relevant for making a mature judgement, and being attentive to the context, i.e., two perspectives, one focused, and one wide. This includes paying attention to the psychology of the persons involved: to their wishes and to their intentions, and to what they are capable of doing and what they are prepared to do.

In addition, the mature person's feelings are such feelings which support his or her moral judgement-making, that is, which motivate to making mature judgements and acting on them and which support the process of making true factual judgements which are used as information material in the process of making mature judgements. The feelings which best satisfy these requirements are those which we mean when we use the expression sympathy: Pleasant feelings without intensity, i.e., friendly feelings, which express themselves as joy at the company of the other. Sympathy replaces mental phenomena which contain self-centred attitudes and destructive feel-

ings: hatred, contempt, disgust, envy, or fear. These are neutralised by one's sympathy.

Thus a universal sympathy as mental attitude and as feeling is needed for moral competence in judgement and in action.

Intensive/strong feelings like the emotion of love do not allow for critical reflection and for prudence, which are a requirement for autonomy, and thus for maturity. Instead they motivate to making judgements which do not have to take either the agent him- or herself, nor all other human beings into consideration. For this reason, love of man is not optimal for realising the basic demands of morality in a longer time perspective, and since maturity implies such a competence, it is not compatible with love of man.

On the other hand, a universal, continuous sympathy implies autonomy in a certain meaning of the word, namely as a morally relevant autonomy, one which gives a moral competence in judging and in acting and thus in realising the aims of morality. This meaning of autonomy corresponds to our everyday use of the expression of maturity. And since maturity is continuous, and since morality demands taking all men into consideration when judging how to act, the kind of sympathy allowing for maturity must be continuous and universal.

The mental attitude included in universal sympathy is the key to maturity: A person who takes such an attitude towards others will experience feelings of joy at the intercourse with others, and his or her sympathy, as a universal, continuous affirmative mental attitude and as a continuous feeling experience, will make him or her autonomous enough to fulfil the aims of morality, which means that he or she is mature in the everyday sense of the word.

In the next chapter we will examine the everyday expression of autonomy and its relation to those of morality, maturity, sympathy, and mature judgement. This will also make clear how the everyday expression of sympathy is related to these other expressions.

Chapter 3

Autonomy

MATURITY, AUTONOMY, AND SYMPATHY: AN OVERVIEW

In the last chapter we saw that the everyday expression of maturity implies a certain meaning of the everyday expression of sympathy, namely a sympathy which is continuous and universal. But certainly in everyday language today we do not use 'sympathy' as a synonym for 'maturity', and it is not even certain that we necessarily think of a mature person as having sympathy for others. We will have to further clarify the connection between the everyday expressions of maturity and sympathy, and we will do it by an analysis of the everyday expression of autonomy.

In this chapter we will show that the meaning of the everyday expression of maturity corresponds to a certain meaning of the everyday expression of autonomy, and thus that 'maturity' means a autonomy of a certain kind, namely one which gives the capacity to live according to the demands of morality. Autonomy in this sense gives the capacity to make mature judgements and to act on them, and thus a moral competence, namely in furthering the good of those others with whom one has direct intercourse as well as of all members of society.

This is an autonomy which is formed by, i.e., which is made possible by, as well as being given its direction by, and thus being restricted by, what we have chosen to call a universal sympathy, according to a certain use of the expression of sympathy in daily language. This means that the way we use the expressions of sympathy and autonomy in daily language today implies that a person with a continuous, universal

sympathy for others is autonomous in a sense which gives him a moral competence, and this kind of autonomy is what is meant by the everyday expression of maturity.

Probably most people are not aware of this connection between the everyday expressions of sympathy and of maturity through the everyday expression of autonomy, and our study will help clarifying the semantics of these expressions in daily language, which may change our view of and our use of these expressions.

We will start by examining Kant's concept of autonomy, and this will make it clear that autonomy today means something rather different from what Kant had in mind. We will then discuss Kupfer's concept of autonomy, and we will see that it comes much closer to today's autonomy than Kantian autonomy does. This discussion will further help clarifying the meaning of autonomy. Some additional notes on other modern authors will fill in the picture enough for our purposes, namely to exhibit the semantic connections between the everyday expressions of maturity, sympathy, autonomy, morality, and mature judgement.

KANT AND AUTONOMY TODAY

The basis for Kant's concept of autonomy as it is presented in his *Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten* is a will which is free from all influence from interest as stimulus or compulsion, from what is important to one personally, from desires, i.e., (psychophysical) wishes, for one's own benefit, as well as from feelings like pleasure. It is determined solely by reason. Such a will without incentives says that one shall be able to want that one's maxim, i.e., the principle according to which one acts, should become a universal law, valid for all rational beings. This is the categorical imperative, and it is the sole principle of morality. The categorical imperative accepts moral views only if these can be universalised. As an example, one cannot want a life in idleness and pleasure to be universally prescribed, Kant says.[62]

According to Kant in the *Grundlegung*, only a will determined solely by reason is a free will.[63] Autonomy is the freedom of the will, and this is the capacity of the will to

[62] Kant, *Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten* p. 218.
[63] ibid. p. 255.

be a law to itself.[64] The will exercises its freedom in creating the categorical imperative and in subjecting itself to it.[65] Being autonomous thus means letting one's will be guided by one's reason only, and such a will, a free will, is a will which is subjected to its own moral law, i.e., the categorical imperative. This means that Kantian autonomy takes the form of a mental act only, and thus not of practical, physical, action.

The everyday expression of autonomy today connotes being able to decide for oneself what is important to one, i.e., to form one's own opinions concerning what is preferable, and to decide for oneself how one wants to be, i.e., to influence one's own mental life, to judge oneself what to do in practical action, and to perform the corresponding actions. Thus autonomy includes being empowered to act on one's will, to realise one's will in practical action, that is, to live according to one's own mind. Thus according to the everyday meaning of the expression, the autonomous person is not only able to *want* something freely, he or she is able to influence and thus modify his or her own mental life and to form his or her own life in practical action, which means that autonomy today takes the form not only of a mental act like in Kant, but also of practical action. Forming one's own life means taking care of oneself in daily life and fulfilling oneself, i.e., securing one's survival and making one's life acceptable to oneself, and furthermore, making one's life worth living to oneself.

Further, whereas Kantian autonomy requires that one's will is determined solely by reason, which means that it excludes any kind of influence, autonomy does not exclude influence on one's will of any sort that Kant mentions, neither from interest, nor from what one finds important to oneself, nor from psychophysical wishes, nor from feelings. And in addition it does not exclude influence from other persons' wills, views, and emotional reactions. These things are all allowed to influence one's will, if only one has checked them and found them acceptable, which means that one judges that they are compatible with what one thinks is important and correct, either in the situation, as being useful, or while corresponding to reality, as being true.

The fact that Kantian autonomy as presented in the *Grundlegung* manifests itself in creating a moral principle and in subjecting one's will to it means that Kant can derive morality from his concept of autonomy, since autonomy determines what is

[64] Kant, *Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten* p. 247.
[65] ibid. pp. 228.

morally right or wrong: What one can do out of free will in the Kantian sense is morally allowed, and what one cannot do out of free will is morally prohibited. For this reason a human being, if only he or she chooses to use his or her reason, always knows what is morally correct: The categorical imperative makes it possible to distinguish between good and evil, and by following it, one always knows what to do morally, he says.

Autonomy in the everyday sense today on the other hand as such gives no moral guidelines. As we have noted, it is the capacity to decide for oneself what is important to one, which means forming one's own opinions concerning what is right and wrong, and to decide for oneself how to act. This does not imply a certain morality; autonomy today gives one the freedom to choose, but it cannot tell one what to choose. Thus whereas Kantian autonomy is a moral concept, autonomy in the everyday sense today is not; like the everyday expression of rationality, it is non-moral, morally indifferent. Later we will see that an autonomy which is based on sympathy in a certain sense of the word indirectly implies a certain morality, but what implies this morality is in reality sympathy, and not autonomy as such.

Kant's definition of autonomy, as creating and subjecting one's will to a certain moral principle, means that Kantian autonomy is punctual, i.e., it is exercised only in certain cases, namely when the agent is confronted with a moral problem situation. Only in such a situation is there a reason to ask oneself whether one can want that a certain action shall be prescribed as a universal law. This is the mental act which confirms one's autonomy. According to the way we use the expression of autonomy in everyday language today, autonomy is nothing which one has at one moment and not at the next; autonomy is manifested not only in moral problem situations, but in a continuous exercise of influence over one's mental life and in continuously forming one's life in practical action.

In the *Grundlegung* Kant assumes that all men can easily reason themselves to the categorical imperative and that everyone can subject his or her will to it: It requires no special intelligence and no experience of life,[66] and as consisting solely in an act of the will, of course it does not require access to any material goods. This means that everyone can be autonomous, and that there are no degrees of autonomy. Either one

[66] Kant, *Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten* pp. 192-193.

is autonomous or one is not; either one creates and subjects one's will to the moral law for the right reasons, and then one is autonomous, or one does not, and then one is not autonomous.

But according to the way we use the expression of autonomy in daily language, people differ in their autonomy: Some men are more autonomous than others, since some exercise a stronger influence over themselves and over their own lives than others do. They are more certain of what they want, they fear less, and they have more energy, which makes them more able to concentrate on performing the tasks they have formulated for themselves, and they are more independent of others, materially, emotionally, and prescriptive.

Our discussion of Kantian autonomy has shown that today's everyday expression of autonomy means something quite different from Kantian autonomy, and it has given some hints concerning what autonomy today consists in. We will now discuss Kupfer's theory of autonomy, which will further help clarifying the nature of today's everyday expression of autonomy.

KUPFER AND AUTONOMY TODAY

In today's philosophical literature, autonomy is defined as either self-determination (for example Kupfer, Steinfath), self-direction (for example Oshana, Berofsky), or self-governance/self-government (for example Kupfer, Oshana, Jacobs, Den Uyl),[67] and these concepts all mean much the same. For this reason, and since in this study we refer to philosophical theories only with the aim of clarifying common sense, we will here confine ourselves to a discussion of Kupfer's concept of autonomy as put forward in his *Autonomy and Social Interaction*. We will see that Kupfer's definition of autonomy comes much closer to the way we use the expression of autonomy in everyday language today than Kant's definition does.

[67] Kupfer, *Autonomy and Social Interaction* p. 9. Steinfath, *Orientierung am Guten. Praktisches Überlegen und die Konstitution von Personen* p. 392. Oshana, *How Much Should We Value Autonomy?* p. 100, 103. Berofsky, *Identification, the Self, and Autonomy* p. 204. Jacobs, *Some Tensions Between Autonomy and Self-governance* p. 221. Den Uyl, *Autonomous Autonomy: Spinoza on Autonomy, Perfectionism, and Politics* p. 34.

Kupfer defines autonomy as self-determination, which means being self-governing, he says. This means arriving at one's beliefs independently, by means of critical reasoning, and choosing for oneself what to think, namely one's values, what one thinks is right and good, and what sort of person one wants to be and what one wants to do, based on these values.

Leaving aside for the moment the question of independently arriving at one's beliefs,[68] we may note that Kupfer's demand of choosing one's values and deciding oneself what sort of person one wants to be and what to do is met by autonomy in the everyday sense today: In our discussion of Kant, we noted that the everyday expression of autonomy today connotes being able to decide for oneself what is important to one, i.e., to form one's own opinions concerning what is preferable, and thus to decide for oneself how one wants to be, i.e., to influence one's own mental life, as well as to judge oneself what to do in practical action.

The key word in Kupfer's concept of autonomy is critical reasoning.[69] For Kupfer, autonomy means choosing how to be, what to think, and what to do through deciding what is especially important to one and how to realise this. Autonomy requires that one's will is fully one's own, and this requires deliberation not only on the means to satisfy one's current desires, i.e., one's (psychophysical) wishes, but also on their aims, assessing the value of one's wishes in terms of their importance rather than in terms of their intensity, duration, or urgency. Autonomy thus requires acting out of a desire which one has evaluated and decided to act on.

In our discussion of Kant we concluded that autonomy means that one is oneself the origin of one's choices and actions, which means choosing and acting according to one's own will. But this will is not just any kind of will; carrying on with some activity which one finds boring because one knows that finishing this activity successfully will be rewarding is a sign of autonomy in the everyday sense, while giving way to one's wish to stop doing it because of one's boredom is a sign of lack of autonomy. This shows that the kind of will which is meant here is a will which corresponds to what one holds as being correct while being important to one, either as being useful or as being true, which means that it is a reasoned will, which corresponds to what

[68] This question is discussed on p. 90.
[69] See Kupfer, *Autonomy and Social Interaction* p. 9.

one thinks is right, what one has deliberated on and accepted as being the most relevant thing to do. In the case just mentioned, of carrying on with a boring activity, one act of will opposes another, and the one which corresponds to what one finds correct while more important is the one which determines one's autonomy.

Kupfer distinguishes between autonomy of judgement, of will, and of action. Autonomy of judgement or intellectual autonomy means being able to deliberate on the correctness of one's beliefs and values by assessing their justification. Autonomy of will means being able to determine what should be willed, and to deliberate over choices, make decisions, and act on these. Being able to do what one wants Kupfer calls autonomy of action, which indicates that autonomy of action is part of autonomy of will. Autonomy both of judgement and of will Kupfer calls an overall autonomy.[70]

In our everyday use of the expression of autonomy, we do not distinguish between different kinds of autonomy in the way Kupfer does. Autonomy forms a unity, which as we have noted in our discussion of Kant makes it possible to form one's own opinions concerning what is preferable, i.e., choosing one's values oneself. This implies that autonomy makes it possible to determine what should be willed, and it also means being able to judge what to do and to act on one's judgement, and thus to deliberate over choices, make decisions, and act on these. Therewith autonomy in the everyday sense includes all three kinds of autonomy mentioned by Kupfer. We will postpone the discussion whether autonomy implies being able to deliberate on the correctness of one's beliefs and values by assessing their justification until the end of this chapter.[71]

Kupfer claims his concept of autonomy to be broader than that of Kant, which simply consists in self-legislation; Kupfer's own concept of autonomy takes the abilities and dispositions which make us self-determining into consideration, he says.[72] One's autonomy is affected by a lot many things depending on one's abilities and on the situation. Autonomy requires having a certain self-concept, namely a conception of oneself as an independent originator of thought and action. Further it requires inte-

[70] Kupfer, *Autonomy and Social Interaction* pp. 10, 14.
[71] It is discussed on pp. 112-114.
[72] Kupfer, *Autonomy and Social Interaction* p. 42.

gration of one's beliefs, opinions, interests and projects, i.e., that they form a unity, that is, that they fit together without contradiction, in which case one's mind is one, it is not split. This makes it possible to understand and appreciate their implications for action and for thought, their meaning and weight, and it makes it possible to concentrate one's powers on one purpose, thus giving the mind a certain direction, which makes autonomous.

According to Kupfer, autonomy is constrained by internal factors like mental retardation, severe emotional disturbance, and mental disorders. Further it is constrained by external factors like deception and censorship: misdirection of the agent's thinking and keeping him ignorant.[73] Dependence on others takes the form of accepting other people's judgement without having good reasons to think it reliable. It is a result of others' interference, and of the agent's own habituation, weakness, or choice. Autonomy therefore requires independence from interference and access to relevant information, and in addition having options for choice and action, being able to see the opportunities that exist, and being able to seize the opportunities at hand. Kupfer also mentions energy and self-discipline, access to certain means, and relevant skills - he speaks of flexibility, i.e., the ability to respond creatively and constructively to a variety of circumstances, which includes the ability to adapt to change.[74]

We will postpone our discussion of self-concept and self-integration in relation to autonomy until we have clarified the meaning of the everyday expression of self.[75] Kupfer's notes on internal and external constraints certainly are valid also for autonomy. External constraints are a result of interference. As we have noted, autonomy does not exclude influence as long as one has deliberated on and chosen to accept this influence. On the other hand, autonomy does not allow for dependence on others, neither emotional nor intellectual, which means influence which one has not reflected on and accepted.

Autonomy certainly requires certain means or instruments relevant for acting on one's judgements, like money, as well as access to the information needed for making

[73] Kupfer, *Autonomy and Social Interaction* p. 12.
[74] ibid. pp. 14, 23.
[75] This discussion is found on pp. 95-99.

good factual judgements, as well as skills in discerning opportunities which are given, and, as we have already noted, empowerment to act on one's decisions.

Now it is time to consider Kupfer's claim that autonomy means arriving at one's beliefs independently, by means of critical reasoning, and being able to deliberate on the correctness of one's beliefs and values by assessing their justification, what Kupfer calls autonomy of judgement or intellectual autonomy.

As we have seen, Kupfer defines dependence as accepting other people's judgement without having good reason to think it reliable.[76] Arriving at one's beliefs independently thus means having deliberated on their correctness and having found that they are justified. We described dependence according to the way we use the expression in daily language as influence which one has not reflected on and accepted, and in our discussion of Kant we noted that autonomy in the everyday sense today requires critical examination of internal and external influence on the will, from one's own mind, like feelings and wishes which on reflection one judges as being less important, and from the minds of others, and on choosing whether to accept this influence or not, which means that this influence, if it is accepted, is willed by oneself. This means that autonomy today requires independent reasoning, and this implies that it requires having deliberated on and accepted as true at least one's more important beliefs, which are beliefs which have a certain consequence for one's life, without just accepting more important beliefs which might be motivated by wishes rather than being based on correct information concerning reality, and which may be the beliefs of others which likewise are motivated by wishes instead of being based on correct information. Consequently autonomy too requires having arrived at one's beliefs independently, and thus this aspect of Kupfer's theory of autonomy too is covered by autonomy in the everyday sense today.

But according to Jacobs in *Some Tensions Between Autonomy and Self-governance,* having been raised in a way that excludes certain kinds of perception and action so that it does not occur to one to think and act differently does still not exclude a considerable freedom of the will ('voluntariness') and thus autonomy, what he calls self-governance. For a state to be voluntary, it is not required that the agent had complete control over its initiation and establishment; willingness to accept ends and practices

[76] Kupfer, *Autonomy and Social Interaction* p. 12.

can be sufficient for the voluntariness of states and acts, Jacobs says.[77] And Steinfath admits that it is not possible to acquire all information which may be relevant, and that it is not even possible to examine all the relevant information which one actually acquires. For this reason, in his *Orientierung am Guten* Steinfath allows for self-determination (*Selbstbestimmung*) based on hypothetical reflection: The person would not have acted differently had he deliberated on the matter. But he stresses that in certain spheres and situations which are especially important for the person's life, self-determination requires making explicit deliberations.[78]

This certainly is valid also for autonomy today. Checking all information oneself is simply not possible; a lot of things one has to take for granted, and the everyday expression of autonomy seems to be dependent more on reflection than on knowledge: on the critical examination of the information which one actually acquires, rather than on having access to all relevant information. But at least in more important questions of life, it will not do just to follow one's habit; in such situations, actual, not only hypothetical, critical reflection is needed for autonomy according to the way we use the expression in daily language; the agent must reflect on the matter and choose according to what he himself thinks is correct. This does not exclude that the agent's whole way of reasoning is something which reflects a certain intellectual tradition.

From the way our examinations of the concepts of autonomy of Kant and of Kupfer have revealed the meaning of autonomy to us, we may conclude that autonomy primarily connotes the capacity to influence oneself, directly or indirectly, by accepting or rejecting internal or external influence, and therewith influencing who one is, and therewith forming one's life oneself in taking care of oneself in daily life and in fulfilling oneself, i.e., securing one's survival and making one's life acceptable to oneself, and furthermore, making one's life worth living to oneself.

Kupfer notes that deciding how one wants to be and how one wants to live generally has to do with the nature of the self. This implies that the self plays a crucial role in autonomy in the everyday sense today. For this reason, before we complete our examination of the nature of today's autonomy, we will have to investigate what this

[77] Jacobs, *Some Tensions Between Autonomy and Self-governance* p. 229.
[78] Steinfath, *Orientierung am Guten* pp. 414, 432.

self is which the autonomous man is capable of influencing, i.e., what is meant by the expression 'self' in everyday language.

THE SELF

In both Aristotle and in Kant, man's self is his reason. For Aristotle, the intellectual part, the thinking part, of man is the self,[79] and Kant defines man's genuine self both as intelligence (reason) and as will.[80] This means that for both Aristotle and for Kant, the self is a purely mental factor. But according to Mischel and Mischel in *Self-control and the Self*, the expression 'I cut myself' shows that the self is a living organism, and they identify this living organism with the person.[81] And according to Alston in *Self-Intervention and the Structure of Motivation*, in ordinary speech we do not distinguish between self, person, and human being: The self is the real, unitary agent.[82]

If the self in the everyday sense is the same as the agent, then the self is the subject of deliberation, choice, and action. Likewise, Steinfath defines the self as the subject of all practical deliberations, i.e., all deliberations which aim at checking and guiding our decision-making and acting, which means also all non-moral decisions and acts.[83]

But philosophers have also been sceptical concerning the existence of a self. According to Johnstone in *The Problem of the Self*, we encounter persons in our everyday life, but we do not encounter selves, except possibly for our own. And Johnstone goes as far as calling the self a hypothesis used to explain the behaviour of persons, whereas we do not claim the existence of persons to be a hypothesis. Nearly everything that a person is and does can be adequately explained without appealing to the self, so there is almost never any need to invoke this hypothesis, he says.[84] If Smith has 'self-control', then Smith is in control of Smith rather than being in control of Smith's self. And 'self-consciousness' is not consciousness of a self; it is either a person's consciousness of him- or herself, i.e., of a person, or consciousness of consciousness.[85]

---

[79] Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 1166a22.
[80] Kant, *Grundlegung* pp. 261-262.
[81] Mischel & Mischel, *Self-control and the Self* p. 51.
[82] Alston, *Self-Intervention and the Structure of Motivation* pp. 66-67.
[83] Steinfath, *Orientierung am Guten* pp. 14-15, 394.
[84] Johnstone, *The Problem of the Self* pp. 15-16.
[85] ibid. p. 32.

The expression 'I cut myself', mentioned above, gives at hand that in daily language today, the expression 'self' is used in a wider sense than in Aristotle and in Kant. But in everyday language, the meanings of the expressions 'self' and 'person' are in fact not quite identical, which means that the everyday expression 'self' clearly makes sense, contrary to what Johnstone says.

It is true that in daily language we use the expression 'self' in much the same way as that of 'person': The self is an individual human mind with all its mental abilities of thinking, feeling, wishing etc., as well as the content of this mind; thoughts, feeling experiences, and so on; but it is also this individual's body with all its physical abilities of movement and of action, and this individual's characteristic ways of reacting and behaving. That 'self' today means more than an individual's mind, that it also includes his or her body, is clear not only from the saying 'I cut myself', but moreover from the fact that we tend to identify strongly not only with our views, especially with our values, and with our characteristic ways of reacting emotionally, saying that a certain way of thinking and feeling 'is' oneself, that one *is* one's own views, for example, but that we also tend to identify strongly with our bodies, for example in judging an injury wilfully done onto our bodies by others as an attack not simply on our bodies but on ourselves, and this even in cases where we are asleep or unconscious. On the other hand, the fact that sometimes we may speak of an attack on a person's body as an attack on him- or herself even when he or she is already dead, and consequently when the mind has ceased to exist, as in the case of the mutilation of a dead human body in a war or of the desecration of someone's grave, is an incorrect use of the expression 'self', since it is based on one's imagining the dead body as still being connected to a functioning mind, which is not the case. Thus selfhood requires having both a mind and a body.

In *Self Expressions. Mind, Morals, and the Meaning of Life*, Flanagan claims psychological and bodily continuity to be essential for personhood: Being a person means being a continuous organism, he says.[86]

Certainly an individual human being's mind and body with all their functions is also what we mean by a person in daily language, and as in the case of the self, after

[86] Flanagan, *Mind, Morals, and the Meaning of Life* note 35 p. 87.

some afterthought we would not call a dead human body a person. But still the use of the everyday expressions of self and person differ.

In daily language, the expression 'self' almost exclusively appears in the expressions 'myself', 'yourself', 'himself', 'herself', 'itself', 'ourselves', 'yourselves', and 'themselves'; one hardly speaks of just 'selves'. The expression 'self' is used for the agent, as in 'I built this house myself' or 'He did it all by himself', but furthermore, 'self' is used in the meaning of an internal perspective, either my own or that of another, signifying that individual's own experiences: The consciousness of having a life of one's own, of being the subject of experience, characterised by unity and continuity, we call a sense of self, Flanagan says.[87] The fact that he claims that 'we' call this a sense of self shows that he refers to the everyday use of the expression. Selfhood thus depends on the individual's own mental and physical functioning only.

'Person' too is used of the agent, as in 'That person did this to me', but mostly for other individuals, although in seldom cases the expression 'my person' is used, as in 'I am not carrying any weapon on my person'. 'Person' is used in the meaning of an external perspective: Personhood is dependent on one's status as an individual in a community of men, which means that for being a person, one must engage in certain social relations which are recognised by other individuals, and thus when one says 'I as a person' or 'my person', one means oneself as a member of society, with the same rights and duties as other members, i.e., as someone who can be made responsible for his actions. This shows that according to the way we use the expressions in daily language, 'person' has a wider meaning than 'self'.

The everyday expression of self as meaning mind and body with all their functions intact implies being able to use these functions, i.e., to intend, to judge, to choose, and to act, which implies that the mind is able to control both itself and the body, which means that a certain part of the self is able to control the rest, and this part is what we call will. This is what we mean by the expression 'being oneself' in the meaning of being in control of oneself: We say of a person who is so angry that he or she is not able to think clearly and not to deliberate on what he or she really finds important and correct, either as being useful or as being true, so that he or she makes decisions and acts in ways which he or she would not otherwise do and which he or she will

[87] Flanagan, *Mind, Morals, and the Meaning of Life* pp. 61-64.

have reason to regret later, that he or she is not him- or herself. This indicates that being oneself implies having a reasoned will, i.e., that one's will corresponds to one's beliefs and to one's more important views. And thus in a certain sense having a self requires 'being oneself', which means being able to influence oneself, which means that selfhood implies a certain autonomy in the everyday sense.

From the internal perspective, the self is the originator of one's judgements, decisions, choices, and actions; from the external perspective, the originator is the person. Consequently we speak of 'influencing oneself' rather than of 'influencing one's person'. And as we have seen, influencing oneself means that the self influences itself, i.e., that a certain part of the self, namely what we call will, influences the rest of the self, mind and body.

'SELF-IMAGE' AND 'INNER HARMONY'

Now we are able to comment on Kupfer's requirements, mentioned earlier in this chapter, of having a certain kind of self-concept and of being integrated in one's beliefs, opinions, interests, and projects for being autonomous.

According to Kupfer, thinking and acting autonomously requires having an autonomous self-concept, which means a conception of oneself as a self-determining being, that is, as an independent originator of thought and action, which means seeing oneself as being able to think one's own thoughts and as being capable of independent choice, and of acting accordingly. This Kupfer calls first-order autonomy of the self-concept, which means that it is concerned with particular thoughts and 'desires', concrete choices and plans of action.[88] Second-order autonomy of the self-concept means being able to control one's self-concept by means of self-reflection in the forms of self-evaluation and self-criticism. For a full autonomy of the self-concept, not only first-order but also second-order autonomy of the self-concept is needed.[89]

In daily language we rather use the expression 'self-image' than 'self-concept', and of course we do not speak of 'first-order and second-order autonomy of the self-

[88] Kupfer, *Autonomy and Social Interaction* pp. 131-133.
[89] ibid. pp. 135-136.

image'. But still we will have to examine whether what Kupfer means with first- and second-order autonomy of the self-concept is covered by the meanings of our everyday expressions of self-image and of autonomy.

According to the way we use the expression of self-image in everyday language, one's self-image is one's own conception of one's self, i.e., how one sees oneself, one's mind and body and their functions and one's actual execution of these functions. One can have a conception of oneself as a person who is tall, who has a bad memory, who is easily frightened, who enjoys a good meal, who is good at playing the flute, etc.

One's self-image can be more or less clear, due to in how far we are certain of the way we are. If we are not certain of the way we are, of our capacities and characteristic ways of reacting, our self-image will be confused while vague and possibly contradictory. This indicates that our self-image can correspond more or less to the way one is, i.e., to the nature of one's self, and thus that it can be more or less correct.

We need a self-image for being able to orientate in the world around us, and thus for being able to relate to situations and to other people. In our discussion of Kupfer we noted that autonomy in the everyday sense today requires access to valid information. According to Steinfath, self-determination requires enough relevant and correct information concerning the world. Knowledge of the world here means knowledge of the social world, he says.[90] This must mean the character of our daily human intercourse. Having false views means that our willing is influenced by something unknown to us, Steinfath says.[91] But in addition, having feelings and wishes of which one is not (fully) aware, i.e., which are not fully known to one, implies a lack of self-determination, since they can influence one's will, quite apart from the fact that they can be manipulated by others. This implies that self-determination requires not only knowledge of the world, but also knowledge of oneself.[92] And of course this is valid also for autonomy in the everyday sense today.

According to its use in daily language, the expression 'self-knowledge' means knowledge of the nature of one's self, with all its functions, one's abilities and one's

[90] Steinfath, *Orientierung am Guten* p. 403.
[91] ibid. p. 406.
[92] ibid. pp. 417-418.

characteristic ways of using one's functions, mental and physical, as well as one's current use of these. But in daily language, self-knowledge means more than just knowledge of isolated mental and physical functions and the individual uses of these: Self-knowledge also connotes an overview over the self as a whole, mental and physical, and thus a knowledge of how different capacities and uses of these capacities are connected and influence each other, which sheds light on their importance as part of a system of functions. In addition, self-knowledge also includes knowing oneself in a social sphere, how one's own mental and physical acts are related to those of others. This knowledge is necessary for being able to use one's functions, mental and physical, and thus it is necessary for autonomy. We have also noted that autonomy requires being able to critically examine and accept or reject influence on the central part of one's self, namely on one's will, from other parts of the self, e.g., from feelings and from (psychophysical) wishes which on reflection one would judge as being less important, and from other people, their expressed demands, their emotional reactions, etc. This of course requires being aware of this influence, which requires self-knowledge. Self-knowledge is given by a self-image which is fairly correct, which corresponds to reality in essential aspects, which means that autonomy requires having a correct self-image.

But autonomy, i.e., being able to choose oneself what to find important, and to choose oneself how to be and to form one's own life accordingly, requires not only having a fairly correct self-image, but having a self-image of a certain kind, namely one which says that one is autonomous in the everyday meaning of the word. This is a requirement for being empowered to choose oneself what to find important, to choose oneself how to be, and to form one's own life accordingly, and thus for being autonomous according to the way we use the expression in daily language. But just having a self-image which says that one is autonomous in the everyday meaning of the word of course is not enough for autonomy; a person can believe him- or herself to be autonomous in the everyday sense of the word, that he or she is able to form his or her own life, and consequently that he or she freely chooses to carry on with his or her daily routines, although in fact he or she is a slave who was born as a slave and who has never known any other life. Autonomy, according to the way we use the expression in daily language, requires that one's self-image of oneself as being

autonomous in the everyday sense of the word be true, it must correspond to reality; i.e., one must actually be empowered in the way one's self-image says one is. Thus being autonomous in the everyday sense of the word implies having a correct self-image as being autonomous, and this requires continuous empowerment, which requires continuously being able to adjust one's self-image after the current character of one's self, since one's abilities tend to change with time. Thus Kupfer's claims that autonomy requires both being able to control one's self-concept and having a self-concept of a certain kind, namely one which claims one to be an independent originator of thought and action,[93] are both confirmed by the everyday meaning of the expression.

In our discussion of Kupfer, we also noted that Kupfer claims that autonomy of will requires integration of one's beliefs, opinions, interests and projects. The reason for his claim is that inconsistency in our beliefs will move us emotionally and appetitively in different, and thus conflicting, directions: Lack of integration among our beliefs yields incompatible beliefs and commitments and thus inconsistent goals. Integration of one's beliefs and of one's opinions is a requirement for consistency in one's beliefs and in one's opinions, which is necessary for having a coherent ranking of moral values and commitments, and thus for knowing what is most important to one, which is necessary for one's commitments to be consistent.

For Kupfer, integration makes it possible to concentrate one's powers on one purpose, thus giving the mind a certain direction, and it gives an overview over one's life as a whole. This makes one capable of making autonomous decisions concerning individual issues.

In everyday language today we would say that deciding for oneself what is important to one, i.e., forming one's own opinions concerning what is preferable, and deciding for oneself how one wants to be, i.e., influencing one's own mental life, as well as judging oneself what to do in practical action and performing the corresponding actions, which is how we described today's everyday use of the expression of autonomy in our discussion of Kant, requires not only knowing oneself, which means having a correct conception of oneself, but it also requires a certain inner harmony. 'Inner harmony' means that the mind is not in conflict, that there are no essential con-

[93] Kupfer, *Autonomy and Social Interaction* pp. 131-133, 135-136.

flicts between feelings and thoughts: beliefs, wishes, views, and judgements; that there are no conflicts of any kind in the mind which may make one incapable at least of more important decision-making and acting.

This means that 'inner harmony' implies an integration not only of beliefs, opinions, interests, and projects, but of all mental factors of relevance, and thus autonomy implies a wider scope concerning the mind than Kupfer's concept of autonomy does. In daily language we hardly use the expression 'self-integration', and according to the use of the expression 'self' in everyday language, 'self-integration' would include not only the mind but also the body with all its functions, and this is not the way we use the expression 'inner harmony'; inner harmony exclusively connotes mental functions, it is a harmony of the mind.

Inner harmony allows for a correspondence between thinking, feeling, and will, i.e., one wants to act in the way one thinks is right, and one feels well when one does so and unwell when one does not. It is a requirement for internal independence, and thus for empowerment of the reasoned will, which implies that it is a requirement for the will's influence over the rest of the self, and therewith for an influence over oneself, and thus for autonomy.

This shows that Kupfer's stress on integration of one's beliefs, opinions, interests, and projects as a requirement for autonomy is true also of autonomy, although by using another expression and with a slightly wider scope.

AUTONOMY AS AUTHORITY OVER ONESELF

Let us now sum up what we have said so far concerning autonomy in the everyday sense today. Autonomy today consists in being able to decide for oneself what is important to one, i.e., to form one's own opinions concerning what is preferable, and to decide for oneself how one wants to be and to influence and thus to modify oneself accordingly, to judge oneself what to do in practical action, and to perform the corresponding actions. Thus autonomy includes being empowered to act on one's will, to realise one's will in practical action, that is, to live according to one's own mind.

What is autonomous according to our use of the expression in daily language is a human being, not an act of will, a judgement, or an action. Autonomy forms a unity,

it is just one; there is no autonomy of will, of judgement, of action, etc., and consequently one cannot be autonomous in the everyday sense of the word in certain respects but not in others, for example in will but not in judgement, since the abilities which make up autonomy develop simultaneously; there is no autonomous willing without autonomous judging, and the other way round. But the fact that autonomy forms a unity does not exclude that people can be autonomous in the everyday sense of the word in different degrees: Some men are more autonomous than others, since some men have more influence over themselves and consequently over their own lives than others have.

The self in the everyday sense is both mind and body, with all their functions, as well as the actual execution of these functions. The self is the agent and signifies an internal perspective of the individual, according to which the self is the originator of one's judgements, decisions, choices, and actions.

Autonomy today seems to be dependent more on reflection than on knowledge: on the critical examination of the information which one actually acquires, rather than on having access to all relevant information. At least in more important questions of life, it will not do just to follow one's habit. Autonomy requires independent reasoning, which means that it requires having deliberated on and accepted as true at least one's more important beliefs, which are beliefs which have a certain consequence for one's life, and at least in important situations, the agent must reflect on the matter and choose according to what he or she him- or herself thinks is correct. And at least in such important situations, the agent must also reflect on influence on his or her will from other parts of the self, e.g., from feelings and from (psychophysical) wishes which do not correspond to what he or she on reflection judges as being more important, as well as from other people, their expressed demands, their emotional reactions, etc., and he or she must choose whether to accept or to reject this influence according to whether he or she judges it to be compatible with what he or she thinks is important and correct, either in the situation, as being useful, or while corresponding to reality, as being true. This means that autonomy requires having a reasoned will, a will which corresponds to what one concludes is the right thing to do after deliberation on what one finds important. On the other hand, autonomy is nothing which one has at one moment and not at the next; it is manifested not only in moral prob-

lem situations, but in a continuous exercise of influence over one's mental life and in continuously forming one's life in practical action, in taking care of oneself in daily life and in fulfilling oneself, i.e., in securing one's survival and in making one's life acceptable to oneself, and furthermore, in making one's life worth living to oneself.

Deliberation on influence on one's will of course requires being aware of this influence, which requires self-knowledge, i.e., knowledge of the contents of one's self. Self-knowledge requires having a self-image which corresponds to reality in essential respects, which means that autonomy requires having a correct self-image, which requires being able to adjust one's self-image to reality. But autonomy also requires having a self-image of a certain kind, namely one which says that one is autonomous in the everyday sense of the word, since such a self-image is necessary for being empowered to choose oneself what to find important, to choose oneself how to be, and to form one's own life accordingly, and thus for being autonomous. This means that being autonomous in the everyday sense of the word implies having a correct self-image as being autonomous, which of course requires actual empowerment. Empowerment requires inner harmony, which means that there are no conflicts of any kind in the mind which may make one incapable at least of more important decision-making and acting. This allows for a correspondence between thinking, feeling, and will, i.e., one wants to realise one's values, and thus to act in the way one thinks is right, and one feels well when one does so and unwell when one does not. Inner harmony is a requirement for the will's influence over the rest of the self, and therewith for an influence over oneself, and thus for autonomy in the everyday sense.

Our conclusion must be that autonomy today primarily connotes the capacity to influence oneself, and therewith forming one's life oneself.

The everyday expression of self as meaning mind and body with all their functions intact implies being able to use these functions, i.e., to intend, to judge, to choose, and to act, which implies that the mind is able to control both itself and the body, which means that a certain part of the self, namely the will, is able to control the rest. This is what we mean by the expression 'being oneself' in the meaning of being in control of oneself. Being oneself implies having a reasoned will, i.e., that one's will corresponds to one's beliefs and to one's more important views.

As we have noted, autonomy is no moral concept; it is non-moral, morally indifferent. It gives no moral guidelines: Autonomy gives one the freedom to choose, but it cannot tell one what to choose. Thus it does not imply a certain morality. We have also noted that an autonomy which is based on sympathy in a certain sense of the word implies a certain morality, but what implies this morality is in reality sympathy, and not autonomy as such. This we will have to examine further in the next section.

We have noted that autonomy primarily connotes the capacity to influence oneself, and therewith forming one's life oneself. But 'being able to influence oneself' could in fact mean just being able to use one's mental and physical functions without oneself being the origin of one's will. We need another expression which signifies that the agent is him- or herself the origin of his or her own will.

The kind of influence which is at stake here, as the self influencing itself, or more precisely, that a reasoned will, corresponding to beliefs which one has deliberated on and found justified and to values and views which likewise one has deliberated on and found especially important, influences the rest of the self, mind and body, corresponds to the way we use the everyday expression of authority. This implies that autonomy means influence over oneself in the sense of having authority over oneself. Our daily semantic practice concerning autonomy is in no need of expressions like 'determination', 'direction', or 'government', used by academic philosophers.

Having an authority over something does not require influencing factors which are of no interest to the agent: The leader of a group exercises his or her authority over the members of his or her group only in so far as he or she has the power to influence the members in a way which is relevant to him- or herself. To an officer it is relevant that his or her soldiers obey his or her orders, but it is not relevant that they share his or her aesthetic taste, for example. This means that for the officer to have authority over his or her men, it is enough that they obey his or her orders. And the soldiers can still have an authority over themselves, although they obey their officer, if only they have checked this influence and come to the conclusion that it is acceptable, and chosen to accept it. If the soldiers regard their officer's orders as trivial, it may not even be very important for them to be able to choose themselves whether to obey or not, which means that their relevant influence over themselves and thus their author-

ity over themselves is not threatened. For the soldier, being able to choose him- or herself whether to obey or not becomes important only in cases where obeying becomes questionable, like in a case of being forced to use torture against prisoners. Likewise, authority over oneself is not only a reasoned but a relevant influence over oneself, in questions which are of some importance to the agent. In such cases, the agent must deliberate on his or her beliefs, checking their justification, and he or she must deliberate on what is important to him or her and why, as well as on influence on his or her will, and whether it is acceptable or not. One's authority over oneself is not threatened by the fact that one has to observe traffic rules when driving a car, since one accepts and follows the rules because one understands and affirms the aim of these traffic rules, namely to protect the lives of others and of oneself.

Now it is time to examine the relation of the everyday expression of autonomy to that of maturity.

AUTONOMY, SYMPATHY, AND MATURITY

In Chapter 2, we noted that according to Hume, one's sympathy for other persons makes it difficult for one to form an opinion of one's own and to use this opinion when making a judgement concerning how to act. We will quote the relevant passage once again:

> No quality of human nature is more remarkable, both in itself and in its consequences, than that propensity we have to sympathize with others, and to receive by communication their inclinations and sentiments, however different from, or even contrary to our own. This is not only conspicuous in children, who implicitly embrace every opinion propos'd to them; but also in men of the greatest judgement and understanding, who find it very difficult to follow their own reason or inclination, in opposition to that of their friends and daily companions.[94]

With such a conception of sympathy, sympathy and autonomy are in conflict. We will now show that universal sympathy as it was described in the last chapter, although limiting the scope of autonomy as it has been described above, in fact is a

[94] Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature* p. 316.

necessary requirement for a certain kind of autonomy as authority over oneself, namely for an autonomy which is morally relevant. We will show that this connects all the central everyday expressions which we have chosen to study in this work: sympathy, autonomy, maturity, morality, and mature judgement.

To a certain extent the everyday meaning of autonomy in daily language today as authority over oneself is meant as something good, since it makes it possible for the individual to take care of him- or herself without continuous external support, and thus without being a burden to others and thus not to society, and to form his or her own life: to fulfil him- or herself, i.e., securing his or her survival and making his or her life acceptable to him- or herself, and furthermore, making his or her life worth living to him- or herself.

In taking care of oneself one fulfils one's role in society in a basic way by not being a burden to other individuals or to the state. This might perhaps be possible through living from an inheritance and by avoiding the company of others and thus every kind of responsibility towards one's fellow-men, but basically fulfilling oneself in the everyday sense, i.e., making one's own life worth living to oneself, is dependent on successful interaction with other members of society. But in addition to just being independent of others, autonomy gives one the capacity to fulfil one's role in society in a wider sense, namely in performing a variety of social tasks as a company worker, a family member, a friend, and as a citizen, tasks which all serve the good of others and thus ultimately that of society as a whole, and thus indirectly all members of the community. This is what we expect from all biological adults in our society, and for this reason we expect all biological adults to be autonomous in the everyday sense of the word and thus being capable of actively working for the good of society.

But today there is also a concept of autonomy with bad connotations. Referring to the way autonomy was treated by the ancient Greeks will help clarifying why this is so.

In ancient Greek literature αυτονομια, consisting of the words αυτος, meaning self, and νομος, meaning law, meant being one's own law-giver, that is, deciding for one-self. It is used by Sophocles in *Antigone*, by Xenophon in *The Spartan Constitution*, and

by Isocrates in *Panathenaicus*.[95] According to Griffith in his commentary to *Antigone* in The Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics, this is the earliest occurrence of the word αυτονομια in Greek texts.[96] In Xenophon and in Isocrates, αυτονομια is used in much the same way, and by both authors in relation to the Spartan state. For these reasons we will discuss all three of these examples.

By Sophocles, the word αυτονομια is used of Antigone in freely accepting her death penalty. Her brother Polyneikes has lead an army against Thebes to claim the throne, but his army was defeated and Polyneikes himself was killed. Antigone's uncle Kreon, taking over the rule of Thebes, forbids the burial of the dead Polyneikes, but for reasons of kinship and the will of the gods, Antigone feels obliged to bury her brother in spite of Kreon's prohibition. After having been arrested, brought before Kreon, and sentenced to death, she commits suicide. In the prose translation by Hugh Lloyd-Jones, at Antigone's appearing before Kreon, the choir of Theban elders says:

> Is it not with glory and with praise that you depart to this cavern of the dead? Not smitten by wasting maladies nor paid the wages of the sword, of your own will you alone of mortals while yet alive descend to Hades [αλλ αυτονομος ζωσα μονη δη θνητων Αιδην καταβησηι].[97]

Griffith translates αυτονομος as 'observing your own law' or as 'voluntary'.[98]

By Xenophon the expression αυτονομια is used negatively as simply doing what one pleases. Xenophon is an admirer of Sparta, and in *The Spartan Constitution* he tries to explain why Sparta, although having such a small population, could become the most powerful and famous city in all of Greece. He explains this by referring to the laws of Lycurgus, which according to Xenophon are the reason for the success of the Spartans. Xenophon discusses the begetting and the education of children in Sparta, and then he says:

> When they [the boys] cease to be children and attain puberty, the other Greeks release them from the pedagogues, set them free from their teachers; no one is in charge of

[95] The sources are mentioned by Cooper in his *Stoic Autonomy* pp. 2-3. According to Griffith in his edition of *Antigone* (p. 268), αυτονομια is also used by Herodotus (1.96) and Thucydides (1.144).
[96] Sophocles, *Antigone*, ed. Mark Griffith, p. 268.
[97] Sophocles, *Antigone* 817-822.
[98] Sophocles, *Antigone*, ed. Mark Griffith, p. 268.

> them anymore, but they are allowed to live as they like [αυτονομους αφιασιν]. Lycurgus, however, instituted quite different customs from these too. Realizing that men of this age are very high-spirited, that insolence predominates, and that the most intense physical desires beset them, he imposed on them much labour and contrived that they should have very little leasure.[99]

In Isocrates's *Panathenaicus* the expression αυτονομια is used by one of Isocrates's former students, who is now a member of an oligarchic government and who likes to praise the Spartans, and who claims that the Spartans have discovered the finest way of life, which they have adopted themselves and revealed to others. Isocrates himself then complains about the Spartan custom of allowing children to steal and even admiring theft among children, as long as the little thieves are not caught. In this practice there is nothing noble or righteous; it is shameful and far outside common decency, he says. His former student answers:

> 'You… have presented your argument as if I approved of everything there and thought everything was just fine in Sparta. In my opinion, however, it is reasonable to fault them for the freedom they give their children [της των παιδων αυτονομιας] and on many other grounds, but you accuse me unfairly.'[100]

From this we learn that among the Greeks, autonomy meant either freely accepting the result of one's actions (Sophocles), doing what one wants instead of being forced to activities which are useful for one's society (Xenophon), or being allowed to do bad things instead of being forced to activities which are in accordance with the ideals of justice and of moral nobility (Isocrates). This indicates that among the Greeks, simply deciding for oneself was not necessarily considered a good thing. Especially in Xenophon, we have the impression that he fears that if everyone would start acting after his or her own mind, society would collapse, and lawlessness would follow. Similarly, in the *Politics* Aristotle says that the freedom to do as one pleases is not compatible with holding back the bad things that exist in every man.[101]

---

[99] Xenophon, *The Spartan Constitution* 3.1-2.
[100] Isocrates, *Panathenaicus* 215.
[101] Aristotle, *Politics* 1318b39-1919a1.

The problem of the Greeks still haunts us: In everyday language today, 'autonomy' as being able to form one's life after one's own mind implies not only being able to take care of oneself without continuous external support, and thus without being a burden to others and thus to society; it also implies independence of social ties.

Freeing oneself from all emotional ties to family members and friends, from all admiration or respect for persons who might serve as one's model, and from all the moral views which others share, would surely allow for a very independent reasoning, but the moral value of this reasoning is questionable. The more autonomous a person is, the less dependent he or she is on external influence and thus on accepted conventions, and this might be seen as a threat to others and to society. Thus an autonomous person, who decides for him- or herself how to live his or her life, might choose to break the law.

We have noted that autonomy is no moral concept; it is non-moral, morally indifferent. It gives no moral guidelines: Autonomy is the capacity to decide for oneself what is important to one, which means forming one's own opinions concerning what is right and wrong, and to decide for oneself how to act. This gives one the freedom to choose, but it cannot tell one what to choose. This means that, as we have noted before, autonomy as such does not imply a certain morality; a person can use his autonomy for the good of other people and for society as a whole, which is what morality in the everyday sense of the word demands, but he can also use it simply for obtaining his own aims. Similarly, as we use the expression of rationality in daily language, it tells us *how* to evaluate, but not *what* to evaluate. In Chapter 1 we noted that in everyday language, 'rational' means that something is appropriate, i.e., adapted, suited, to its purpose. But we do not use the everyday expression of maturity in the meaning of being a rational agent.

We use the expression 'morality' in a social context: As we noted in Chapter 1, the everyday expression of morality connotes different conceptions of how to live as to support other individuals with whom one has more or less direct personal contact, as well as to support the stability and thus permanence of society as a whole, for the sake of all of its members. The everyday meaning of morality implies that the members of society should not only live from society, they should also contribute to its good by fulfilling their roles as members of society, therewith supporting all its

members. Being able to live according to morality in the everyday sense requires being able to support oneself enough for being able to support others, and for this reason morality must allow for a basic self-fulfilment, i.e., making one's life worth living to oneself. But it also requires being able to form one's will after the demands of morality and being able to judge accordingly, using these demands as reference.

'Maturity' too is used in a social context: As the expression is used in everyday language, maturity means the competence to judge and to act according to morality. And so it is with 'autonomy': The everyday expression of autonomy means the capacity to form one's life in a social sphere, in a community of people. One is autonomous in the everyday sense of the word in relation to others, and often in opposition to others.

As implying the competence to judge and act according to morality, maturity is both positively and negatively related to autonomy seen as the capacity to judge and act according to one's own mind: Positively, since autonomy makes one able to fulfil the aims of maturity, namely living according to morality; and negatively, since it endangers the fulfilment of this aim by making one able to act contrary to what morality prescribes. This means that maturity, as meaning a quality which makes one able to form one's life in accordance with morality, is the same as autonomy in the positive sense, i.e., a morally relevant autonomy. Consequently a mature man or woman in the everyday sense of the word is a person with an autonomy limited by the concerns of morality, i.e., who makes use of his or her autonomy for the sake of others and of society. And since the preservation of society, one of the aims of morality, requires respect for the laws of the state, being autonomous in the everyday sense as a prerequisite for being mature in the everyday sense cannot imply questioning the law, judging it critically and accepting and rejecting it according to one's own judgement, and then deciding for oneself whether to follow it or not.

Maturity in the sense of a quality which makes one able to fulfil the demands of morality of course cannot imply a moral autonomy, i.e., the capacity to accept or reject all kinds of moral conceptions and to create a morality of one's own. Instead maturity implies accepting and fulfilling a certain kind of morality, namely one which sees to the good of all individuals in society in a longer time perspective, including future generations.

Maturity as a quality which gives the ability to fulfil the aims of morality thus implies being able to question everything except for morality itself, which requires a limited autonomy. Such a limited while morally conditioned autonomy is provided for by a sympathy of the universal kind. Maturity is identical with an autonomy formed by what we have chosen to call a universal sympathy.

Let us now recapitulate what we said in the last chapter concerning universal sympathy. This summary will help clarifying the connections between the meanings of the everyday expressions of sympathy and of autonomy.

At the outset of Chapter 2, we noted that in everyday language we use the expression 'maturity' in a way which implies sympathy in a certain everyday meaning of the word. Already in Chapter 1 we noted that maturity must be connected both to extroversion in the sense of being interested in others, and to unselfishness as something active, i.e. as taking an interest in others for their sake, with the aim of supporting these others, and in Chapter 2 we showed that extroversion and unselfishness in this sense are provided for by a universal sympathy.

In Chapter 2 we claimed that a certain meaning of the everyday expression of sympathy, namely one which is continuous and universal, covers what is needed for a morally relevant autonomy, i.e., a continuous influence over oneself which is used for realising the aims of morality in judging and in acting, taking all men into consideration when judging how to act, and which thus gives a moral competence, and that this is the way we use the expression 'maturity' in everyday language today.

We showed that what we call a continuous, universal sympathy in this work, which is as strong towards all men, consists mainly in a certain attitude, namely as an affirmative mental attitude, and in friendly feelings, which are feelings of joy at human intercourse, and we noted that this affirmative mental attitude means taking an interest in the other for his or her own sake, which is a concern for others. This concern implies that the other, or more precisely, what supports his or her life and what makes his or her life worth living to him or her, is important to one. In universal sympathy, the other is the object of one's sympathy simply as being a fellow human being in a brotherhood of men, and universal sympathy is directed towards all who are involved in a certain situation, and in addition it allows for taking also society as

a whole into regard for the sake of all its members, and it also allows for sympathising with future generations of yet unborn human beings.

The fact that the good of others is important to one is a presupposition for wanting to live according to morality, and wanting to live according to morality is needed for being able to live accordingly, to fulfil its demands. Universal sympathy thereby makes one want to support other people, which means supporting the realisation of the aims of morality. This motivates to making mature judgements and to act on them.

The affirmative mental attitude included in universal sympathy implies concentrating on the relevant aspects of reality, what is relevant for making a mature judgement, and being attentive to the context, i.e., two perspectives, one focused, and one wide. This includes paying attention to the psychology of the persons involved: to their wishes and their intentions, and what they are capable of doing and what they are prepared to do. Further, since the friendly feeling included in universal sympathy is without intensity, it is no hindrance to critical reflection and to prudence, which are requirements for autonomy, and thus for maturity. The friendly feeling motivates to making mature judgements and to acting on them.

Universal sympathy makes autonomous in the everyday sense of the word by providing the agent with what is required for authority over oneself, which are the criteria discussed in this chapter: As we noted in the last paragraph, universal sympathy provides the mind with a certain direction, namely towards what is morally relevant. This makes internally independent by limiting the influence on one's will from feelings and psychophysical wishes, and it also makes one externally independent, independent of the demands of others, by providing the will with an aim of its own.

In *Autonomie im Gehorsam. Die Entwicklung des Distanzierungsvermögens im sozialisierten Handeln,* Blasi claims that the capacity to question normative demands is based on an act of distinguishing between oneself and other authorities by opposing one's own needs and wishes to the external demands, and by accepting what harmonises with these personal mental needs and rejecting what does not.[102] But the agent does not have to actively and intently oppose his or her own wishes, which aim at satisfying his or her own personal needs, to the external demands for being able to question

[102] Blasi, *Autonomie im Gehorsam* p. 305.

these demands. Instead, universal sympathy makes one concentrate on what is morally relevant and care for the realisation of the aims of morality. Therewith one's universal sympathy reduces one's emotional dependence on others as authorities in judgement, and therewith they reduce others' influence on the agent's will. There is no need for opposing one's own personal (psychophysical) wishes to the external demands, and no need for any direct and intended control of the mental processes, to try forcing one's mind in a certain direction.

The everyday expression of sympathy in the meaning of universal sympathy is semantically connected to what is called 'inner harmony' in everyday language, which allows for an integration of one's mental states and attitudes which avoids inner conflicts, and which thus unifies the will, by co-ordinating the agent's feelings, views, and wishes. Further, the direction of the mind provided for by universal sympathy focuses one's attention on what is morally relevant, which improves one's morally relevant perception, which supports one's morally relevant knowledge of the external world. It also provides the agent with psychological skills: It stimulates one's capacity for imagining the psychological lives of others, and for imagining alternatives of action connected to the needs and wishes of others, and thus the consequences of these actions. This supports one's capacity for making mature judgements.

The aim of the will which is provided for by universal sympathy is to fulfil the aims of morality, and the fact that the will has an overall aim strengthens it, which gives it a constancy by directing it towards certain objects. This gives energy, and all this supports the empowerment of the will.

According to the way in which we use the expression 'will' in everyday language, all willing is self-centred to a certain degree: All willing originates in the self, is an expression of the self. No willing is possible without self-centred thoughts: 'I want…'. For this reason there is no genuinely selfless will. A will is a demand, and so in willing, there is always a certain pretension, which means that willing something in the everyday sense of the word is always connected to a direction of one's interest towards one's own person. But although all willing is a sign of self-centredness, still there are significant differences: A self-centred will aims at supporting the person him- or herself; it is a will to satisfy one's own personal needs and preferences, which may be very prosaic things like comfort. But except for willing something exclusively

for one's own sake, and willing something at least partly for other's sake, there is also the kind of will which is furthered by universal sympathy, namely a will which aims exclusively at furthering the good of all others and which thus is not at all self-centred except for the necessary self-centred aspect of willing as such.

But universal sympathy not only allows for an authority over oneself, it also restricts the agent's autonomy: The direction of the mind towards what is morally relevant, which is provided for by universal sympathy, is a mental attitude of interest in others for their sake, which makes one concerned about the external world; it makes one care about the good of other individuals and about the preservation of society for the sake of all its members, thus motivating one to fulfil the demands of morality. This means that the aim with which the will is provided is to live according to morality.

What we have chosen to call universal sympathy provides the agent with a conception of morality, namely that what supports the life of all individual human beings and what makes their lives worth living to them is to be supported, which is what morality prescribes. One's will is now founded on the moral views implied by one's universal sympathy, which are the views contained in morality, as well as on one's more important beliefs which one has deliberated on and found correct. This makes an autonomy building on universal sympathy into a moral concept, as distinguished from standard autonomy, which is more of a practical rationality in the everyday sense. This kind of autonomy, made possible by as well as restricted by universal sympathy, is what we call maturity in everyday language.

The morally relevant autonomy provided for by universal sympathy gives the agent the capacity to question everything which lies outside the sphere of the kind of morality implied by his or her universal sympathy, and this kind of morality is morality. This capacity entails the capacity to question and reject other normative demands than those made by morality. The mature person in the everyday sense of the word, with an autonomy formed by universal sympathy, is able to examine other normative demands and compare them with the demands raised by his or her universal sympathy, and accept those which are compatible with the demands raised by universal sympathy and reject those which are not. Such an autonomy still means being able to decide for oneself what is important to one, i.e., to form one's own opinions

concerning what is preferable, and to decide for oneself how one wants to be and to influence and thus modify oneself accordingly, to judge oneself what to do in practical action, and to perform the corresponding actions, which means that it still means being empowered to act on one's will, to realise one's will in practical action, that is, to live according to one's own mind. The difference to an autonomy which is not formed by sympathy is that this kind of autonomy, this empowerment as authority over oneself, is not used to question one's own sympathy, but instead it accepts one's sympathy, and therewith it is used to realise the aims of morality. This means that a autonomy building on a universal sympathy is a limited autonomy: It does not mean being able to question and accept or reject everything. One does not choose whether to be mature or not in the everyday sense of the word: The mature man or woman in the everyday sense has been raised to a universal sympathy as a form of life; this is nothing which he or she chooses freely, and he or she is not able to question and reject his or her universal sympathy. He or she is autonomous towards all authorities – except for towards his own universal sympathy. Questioning one's universal sympathy would mean questioning one's morally relevant autonomy, which would mean questioning one's maturity, and certainly maturity in the everyday sense does not imply being autonomous enough for being able to reject one's own maturity.

What we have chosen to call universal sympathy thus gives a morally relevant authority over oneself and thus the capacity to make mature judgements and to act accordingly. Such a morally relevant autonomy as a morally relevant authority over oneself is an autonomy which gives a moral competence, i.e., the capacity to influence oneself in important questions of life with the aim of fulfilling the demands of morality. And such a continuous influence over oneself which fulfils the aims of morality, in judgement and in action, corresponds to what is meant by maturity in daily language.

-

Chapter 4
Mature Judgement

MATURITY AND MATURE JUDGEMENT: AN OVERVIEW

We have analysed the everyday expressions of maturity, morality, sympathy, and autonomy, and we will now complete our study of the everyday expression of maturity with an examination of the everyday meaning of mature judgement. In this chapter we will also sum up what we have said concerning maturity in earlier chapters.

We have noted that the meaning of maturity corresponds to an autonomy formed by a universal sympathy. Universal sympathy makes the lives of all other men and what makes their lives worth living to them important to the agent, which motivates him or her to take an interest in others for their sake with the aim of supporting them. This makes the individual moral problem situation important to the agent, and it directs the agent's attention towards the situation and makes him or her concentrate on the morally relevant information in the situation which is necessary for acquiring a morally relevant knowledge, which is used in making good moral judgements. Further universal sympathy motivates to making good moral judgements and to acting accordingly, which means living according to morality in the everyday sense.

Maturity thus gives the capacity to live according to morality. Morality demands good citizenship, which means acting in ways which are useful to other people, either directly or indirectly, and this means supporting the good of all others, directly,

in the actual situation, as well as indirectly, by providing others with possibilities for individual self-fulfilment by supporting the stability and permanence of society for the sake of all its members. This means fulfilling one's role in society, which means taking one's responsibility as a member of the community. This implies fulfilling certain basic moral demands which means that the action is morally acceptable, that it is not blameworthy.

The fact that maturity gives the competence to live according to morality does not mean that it gives the competence to do things which are not demanded by morality. In Chapter 1 we noted that maturity allows for and even requires a certain prudence, and that prudence is not compatible with ruining one's own life. We further noted that as being supererogative, i.e., more than what morality demands, self-sacrifice is neither mature nor immature, since maturity is concerned with the sphere of morals only.

In Chapter 1 we also noted that the everyday expression of maturity is used in connection with intellectual development, which means that what is mature or immature according to the everyday expression is a human mind. But there are also everyday expressions of mature judgement and of mature action: We say both that a certain judgement and that a certain behaviour is mature or immature. This makes it necessary to examine whether or not a mature judgement according to the way we use the expression in daily language is identical with a good moral judgement, and whether or not a mature action is identical with a morally good action.

According to the way we use the expression in daily language, a good moral judgement is a judgement which correctly points out a morally good action, and a morally good action according to our daily use of the expression is an action which fulfils the demands of morality. But the everyday expressions of mature judgement and of mature action mean more than just pointing out a good moral action and fulfilling the demands of morality, respectively.

Although living according to morality is what we call good citizenship, being a good citizen according to the way we use the expression in daily language is compatible with simply adjusting oneself to the current custom in society, without much reflection and knowledge and without intently and freely, i.e., willingly, adjusting oneself for the sake of others.

For this reason maturity cannot imply a standard good citizenship, but only good citizenship of a certain kind. Maturity requires living according to morality for certain reasons and in certain ways: for the sake of others, intently and willingly and after reflection, in full knowledge of what one is doing.

Thus whereas the good citizen can do without much good moral judgement-making, since it is enough that he or she has been raised to follow the custom in his or her society by means of habituation, which does not require much reflection and criticism, which means that in most cases the agent might well just be acting on other persons' good moral judgements without having considered their correctness, maturity as we use the expression in daily language requires making good moral judgements of one's own. These good moral judgements are not just accidentally good; they build on morally relevant knowledge, which means that they build on morally relevant, true factual judgements concerning the situation at hand as well as concerning society.

Further, whereas the aim of the good citizen's morally good acting may be his or her own self-fulfilment, maturity requires having good intentions, i.e., intending the good of others for their sake. The mature man's or woman's moral judgements are judgements which tell him or her how to realise his or her good intentions, which are living according to morality for the sake of others. This implies that whereas the good citizen might well perform morally good actions because of fear of punishment, the mature person must do them willingly instead of reluctantly.

However, these criteria on the mature person's moral judgement are not covered by the meaning of 'good' in the everyday expression 'good moral judgement': A good moral judgement is simply one which tells one how to live according to morality, for whatever reason and in whatever way. It does not get worse simply by the fact that it was not made by the agent him- or herself, and it can be accidental, which means that it must not be founded on relevant knowledge, and it must not be made intently and willingly, and it must not aim at fulfilling the demands of morality for the sake of others.

This indicates that the mature person's moral judgement, which is what we call a mature judgement in everyday language, cannot be reduced to a standard good moral judgement. Instead, a mature judgement is a good moral judgement of a cer-

tain kind, namely one which the agent made him- or herself willingly, with the intention of supporting others for their sake, after critical reflection on the situation at hand, and building on morally relevant knowledge, and thus in full consciousness of what he or she was doing. A moral judgement of this kind fulfils certain conditions of objectivity in the meaning of being reliable: it is clearly formulated, it prescribes only what morality demands, it takes all persons into regard, it is made by the agent him- or herself, it is based on morally relevant knowledge and thus on sufficient relevant information, it can be sufficiently explained and thus motivated by the judge, it is done intently and willingly, i.e., as the result of critical reflection and choice, it is motivated by the agent's own good intentions, and it remains preliminary while revisable in the face of new and relevant information. This means that the mature judgement is not simply a good moral judgement, but one that is trustworthy, which means that it can serve as a moral advice to others.

ARISTOTLE, PRUDENCE, AND MORALITY

We will begin our study of the everyday expression of mature judgement with an examination of Aristotle's concept of φρονησις as it is presented in the *Nicomachean Ethics*, which will help clarifying the meaning of mature judgement in the everyday sense today by showing what it is not, which will also show what it is. Like in previous chapters we will here refer to philosophical theories only in so far as this helps us in our task of clarifying common sense, and we will not argue against any philosophical standpoints.

Aristotle's expression φρονησις is often translated as 'prudence'. For the sake of convenience we will keep this translation here. The translation 'practical wisdom', which is also often used for φρονησις, may seduce one to believe that φρονησις is some kind of practical counterpart to Aristotelian σοφια or 'wisdom', which is erroneous, since φρονησις has nothing to do with σοφια. In a footnote to the *Nicomachean Ethics* Barnes suggests the translation 'practical common sense'.[103] In Chapter 1 we distinguished between different meanings of the expression common sense: as meaning a basic human reason or understanding, which is thought to be the way of rea-

[103] Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics*, translation by J.A.K. Thomson, revised by Hugh Tredennick, note 1 p. 209.

soning of the plain man, unbiased by any schooling of the mind through logical thinking, by scientific standpoints, or by ideological concerns; as meaning the moral intuitions of most men, where something seems obviously morally right or wrong to most people without them having reflected much on the matter, like a certain distribution of goods, or the killing of an innocent person; and as meaning the actual moral views currently held by most people in a community. But φρονησις is neither a basic human reason or understanding - it is not the plain man's way of reasoning concerning moral issues - nor is it moral intuition in the modern sense, since it is not independent of reflection, and nor does it consist in moral views. Instead, it is an an excellence of character (ηθικη αρετη), to which one must be educated by a competent teacher. And Aristotle's view of man is clearly aristocratic: In the *Politics* he says that not all men are able to acquire excellence of character, not even with the very best teaching.[104]

We will now show that the meaning of the Aristotelian concept of prudence as presented in the *Nicomachean Ethics* corresponds to two everyday expressions today, namely prudence and moral judgement, which have distinct functions but which are both implied by the everyday expression of maturity today.

Aristotelian prudence is the capacity to deliberate on what is good and advantageous in view of one's life in general. Therewith it is deliberation on the right mean, that is, the right action, for obtaining a good aim, and it concerns what it is practically possible for the agent himself to do.[105] The particular judgement formed by prudence is imperative; it says what one should or should not do. Aristotle associates the aim with human goods, but the best goods are goods of the soul (ψυχη), or more precisely, certain activities of the soul.

Beasts too have prudence, but of a primitive kind, consisting in a practical skill in supporting themselves materially and in protecting themselves against dangers. This analogy with the capacity of beasts to support and protect themselves sheds light on the function of Aristotelian prudence. According to Aristotle, people of his time tend to think of prudence as the capacity to find out how to obtain the greatest good for

[104] Aristotle, *Politics* 1316a10-11.
[105] Nobody deliberates about things that he cannot do himself, Aristotle says (*Nicomachean Ethics* 1140a31-33).

oneself. Aristotle keeps this view: Prudence presupposes having a true opinion of what is to one's own advantage. But Aristotelian prudence is also the capacity to find out how to obtain the greatest good for others. This is shown by Aristotle's claims that good men, who are men with prudence, do not allow their friends to go wrong, and that the leaders of a household and political leaders must be prudent for being good leaders.

But although Aristotelian prudence is the capacity to deliberate on the right means to support both oneself and others in the best way, it is questionable whether it is a quality with which one deliberates on how best to support everyone one meets. Are strangers included, not to speak of enemies? We have seen that Aristotelian prudence is constructed in analogy with the capacity of beasts to support and protect themselves, and this capacity of beasts certainly includes supporting and protecting their offspring. Likewise, a prudent man is capable of deliberating on how to secure what is best for himself *and* for those for whom he is in some way responsible, depending on his tasks: family, servants, friends, and, for the politician, all the members of the city-state. As an individual, it is one's task to be helpful to one's friends, as the head of a household it is to support the members of one's household: family members and servants, and as the head of the city-state it is to support the population as a whole. This does not exclude that the prudent man's ultimate concern is to support himself, and thus Aristotle can say:

> But it is also true to say of the man of good character that he performs many actions for the sake of his friends and his country, and if necessary even dies for them. For he will sacrifice both money and honours and in general the goods that people struggle to obtain, in his pursuit of what is <morally> fine. For he would rather have intense pleasure for a short time than quiet pleasure for a long time; rather live finely for one year than indifferently for many; and rather do one great and glorious deed than many petty ones. This result is presumably achieved by those who give their lives for others; so their choice is a glorious prize. Also the good man is ready to lose money on condition that his friends shall get more; for the friend gets money, but he himself gains fineness <of character>, so he assigns himself the greater good. He behaves in the same way too with regard to political honours and positions; all these he will freely give up to his friend, because that is a fine and praiseworthy thing for him to do. So it is natural that he is regarded as a man of good character, since he choses

> what is fine in preference to anything else. He may even give up to his friend opportunities for doing fine actions, and it may be a finer thing for him to become the cause of his friend's doing than to have done them himself. Thus we see that in the whole field of praiseworthy conduct the good man assigns himself the larger share of what is fine.[106]

And he states that it is impossible to secure one's own good independently of domestic and political science. What is best for man is his own self-fulfilment (ευδαιμονια), which consists in pleasure as well as in being socially active.

Aristotelian prudence thus must include deliberating on how to promote what is best for others for being able to serve as a means to one's own self-fulfilment, since this self-fulfilment is social in character. Apparently, then, the good man's striving for personal self-fulfilment is his ultimate motivation for his doing well not only in personal matters but also as a friend and as the leader of a household and of the city-state, and consequently, although Aristotelian prudence is the capacity to find the means to secure what is best both for oneself and for others, its ultimate aim is to secure what is best for the agent him- or herself.

Everyday morality today differs from Aristotle's conception of morality in several ways: Aristotle does not distinguish clearly between morality and politics, nor between morality and etiquette. Morality is presented as being a part of or rather an introduction to political science. Morality studies the nature of the good, i.e., what is good for man, but Aristotle claims that this study is properly carried out by political science. Further wittiness and tactfulness, joined in ευτραπελια, are part of morality, which means that a man who is not able to entertain, amuse, others in a pleasant way is immoral. In everyday language today we distinguish both between morality and politics and between morality and etiquette. In daily language we do not speak of political questions, views, and decisions as being moral questions, views, and decisions. The everyday expression of morality concerns individuals only, not a people as a whole, notwithstanding the fact that morality concerns *all* individual members of society, each and everyone taken as an individual. And morality today does not include etiquette, which indicates that how best to please others through an agreeable

[106] Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* 1169a18-b1.

conduct and how to avoid displeasing others, although being socially relevant, are not considered important enough to count as moral questions.

In Chapter 1 we explained that today's everyday expression of prudence means the capacity to judge correctly what is good for oneself and to act on this judgement so as to support oneself. This means that the everyday expression of prudence today is exclusively concerned with oneself. But unlike Aristotle's ethics, morality today is not based on self-fulfilment. It concerns one's behaviour towards other people only: It consists in views concerning how to behave so as to support other individuals, and its aim is to secure mutual support for the members of a community. For this reason morality gives no guidelines concerning self-support, and one cannot act 'morally' or 'immorally' towards oneself.

This means that whereas being prudent according to the meaning of the everyday expression of prudence today means being useful to oneself, being moral means being useful to others. This shows that prudence is distinguished from morality, which indicates that prudence is not a moral quality.

We have noted that morality does not demand of us that we ruin or destroy our own lives in order to assist others; no-one would call a man who refused to sacrifice his own life to support others 'immoral'. Morality demands only that we fulfil certain minimal criteria of good citizenship; of not harming others through physical or mental violence, and of directly helping fellow citizens in need, as well as supporting them indirectly, i.e., their possibilities for self-fulfilment. Morality allows for taking care of oneself, for protecting one's own life and for securing for oneself what makes life worth living to oneself in a basic sense. This means that morality allows for a certain prudence. We also noted that maturity not only is compatible with prudence, but that it even requires prudence: Maturity in the everyday sense implies autonomy, which implies being able to take care of oneself in daily life, which means being useful to oneself, and consequently autonomy implies prudence. Further maturity is a long-term quality; it is nothing which one has at one moment and not at the next, and for providing the agent with the long-term competence to live according to morality, and thus to judge and to act morally well, maturity requires protecting one's life and even securing a certain good for oneself which makes one's life worth living to oneself in a basic sense, and for this reason too maturity requires prudence.

But this does not mean that the ultimate aim of the mature man's or woman's judging and acting is his or her own self-fulfilment, like in Aristotle's ethics. The Aristotelian good man takes an active part in social life, and he supports the good of the community, but the fact that the ultimate aim of his moral acting is benefiting himself shows that Aristotle's conception of human goodness radically differs from the meaning of the everyday expression of maturity today.

Maturity today requires having good intentions, which means intending to live according to morality for the sake of others, without the ultimate aim of benefiting oneself, and for this reason maturity is compatible with prudence only insofar as continuously living according to morality requires prudence. This means that the mature man's or woman's prudence is a minimal prudence, which aims at protecting the person's own life and at securing that his or her life is worth living to him- or herself as far as this is necessary for a continuous moral competence. Consequently the mature man's or woman's prudence serves his or her moral competence and thus ultimately other people rather than him- or herself.

Aristotle's concept of prudence follows from his conception of ethics as the study of what is best for man and how to obtain this, primarily for oneself, and we have now seen that morality, as being quite another conception of morality than that of Aristotle, implies another kind of moral judgement. We will now examine the meaning of today's everyday expression of good moral judgement, and we will show that it forms the basis for the everyday expression of mature judgement, which is the topic of this final chapter of our study.

FACTUAL JUDGEMENT AND MORAL JUDGEMENT

Before we can give a fair description of the nature of the good moral judgement according to the everyday use of the expression today, we must specify what judging means in daily language. We will clarify the nature of judgement by referring to Bell's theory of judgement.

According to Bell in *Frege's Theory of Judgement*, we can distinguish between assertive and unassertive mental acts and assertive and unassertive occurrences of propositions. There are mental acts or states of mind which involve the agent or possessor

in a commitment to the truth of some claim, and there are those which do not. Examples of the second kind are wondering, considering, imagining, or supposing, in which one neither asserts nor judges nor denies anything. Such acts are neither true nor false. Judging, thinking that, believing, denying, agreeing, remembering that, means asserting something, making a certain claim in a proposition expressed by a sentence, which commits the agent or possessor to the truth of the corresponding claim, since the judgement, the belief etc. can be either correct or incorrect, true or false. What a sentence *says* is either true or false; its *meaning* is neither.[107]

Bell distinguishes between internal and external acts of judgement. An internal act of judgement is a mental, assertive act which may or may not result in any physical behaviour; an external act of judgement is a physical act of some sort. External acts of judgement may be either linguistic or non-linguistic: one can express one's judgement concerning a certain theatre performance by saying that it is terrible, i.e. a linguistic act, or by throwing something at the actors, a non-linguistic act.[108] The judgement is an act of putting together tokens (physical, mental, or linguistic) in conformity with certain rules. In the simplest case this involves the assertion that an object falls under a concept, or that a concept falls within a higher level concept.[109]

Bell's description of judgement corresponds to the way we use the expression 'factual judgement' in daily language. The everyday expression 'factual judgement' means something primarily internal, namely a mental, assertive act, which takes the form of a claim made in a proposition and expressed by a sentence. In addition, 'factual judgement' also means an external claim made in the form of a linguistic act, which means that something is uttered, it is said. An example of a factual judgement is 'I am now sitting in front of a computer'.

The factual judgement states the objective existence of an object or of objects or of a certain relation or relations between objects, or that a certain object or objects or certain relations between certain objects do not exist. Although there is a semantic connection between the everyday expression of factual judgement and that of sense perception, so that the factual judgement, according to the way we use the expression in

[107] Bell, *Frege's Theory of Judgement* pp. 99-103, 114. All these references are to Bell's own concept of judgement.
[108] ibid. p. 100.
[109] ibid. pp. 139-140.

daily language, builds on sense perception, 'objective existence' according to the way we use the expression in everyday language means an existence which is independent of an agent perceiving something or making a certain claim. This means that although we make what we call factual judgements on the basis of sense perception, the meaning of the everyday expression of factual judgement implies that what the factual judgement states, namely a certain fact about the world, is true independently of one's judgement-making, so that it would be true even if no factual judgements were made.

This means that according to the way we use the expressions in daily language, 'factual judgement', 'truth' and 'falsehood' are semantically connected, so that it is part of the meaning of a factual judgement that it is necessarily either true or false: Either I am actually sitting in front of a computer or I am not. What is true or false in the factual judgement according to its meaning in everyday use is what the sentence, which expresses the proposition which makes up the factual judgement, says, namely the claim, namely that certain objects or relations between objects do or do not exist. This means that the way the everyday expressions 'factual judgement' and 'truth' are semantically connected implies that our everyday semantic practice assumes the correctness of the correspondence theory of truth for factual judgements: What is 'true' is a claim which correctly describes reality and which therefore corresponds to reality. But we will see that our semantic practice does not assume this for moral judgements.

According to our everyday use of the expression 'truth', a truth is something which is unchangeable, and therewith permanent. That Caesar was murdered by Brutus is a factual judgement about the relation between two objects, namely two human beings, namely that the first was killed by the second, which implies that this judgement is either true or false, according to the way we use the expressions 'factual judgement', 'truth', and 'falsehood'. If it is true now that Caesar was murdered by Brutus, then this was true in 44 B.C., and it will be true in a thousand years as well, and it would still be true even if mankind were to die out, which means that this truth is not dependent on a human perception or on a human claim.

According to the way we use the expressions 'truth' and 'knowledge' in everyday life, there is no partial truth, but there is partial knowledge of the truth. Truth does

not change, for example with scientific development; what changes with scientific development is not truth itself, but our knowledge of the truth. Obtaining knowledge in the everyday sense does not mean that the world changes, but that our views of the world change, towards views which better correspond to the world. This means obtaining knowledge of a truth which is there all the time, and this process may well be gradual. Thus when we say 'This is not the whole truth', we mean that this is not everything that can be known about the object or the occurrence. Interestingly, although we say 'Now our knowledge has changed' meaning that it has increased, we never say 'Now truth has changed'.

In daily language we use the expression 'factual judgement' in quite another sense than that in which we use the expression 'moral judgement'. But before we can examine this difference we must state what we mean by the expression moral judgement in everyday language.

We have seen that Aristotelian prudence is the capacity to find the right mean to realise a certain moral aim, and that the exercise of Aristotelian prudence results in an action prescription. This means that Aristotelian prudence is not a particular judgement as a proposition, but instead the capacity to make moral judgements.

The Aristotelian good man reasons himself to what is to be done by means of drawing the correct conclusion from two premises, one major or universal premise and one minor and particular, of what is called the practical syllogism, for example: 'Do not kill any human beings', and 'This is a human being'. By using his prudence, the Aristotelian good man draws the conclusion 'Do not kill this human being'. This means that the Aristotelian particular moral judgement does not say what is good or bad or right or wrong; it takes the form of an action prescription only, which is valid in an individual case, and which says only what the agent him- or herself should do. It concerns the agent's treatment of him- or herself - for Aristotle there is at least one purely self-related moral excellence of character, namely μεγαλοφυχια or magnanimity - and of others, but not others' treatment of the agent, and not others' treatment of themselves or of each other.

Likewise, there is an everyday expression of moral judgement today as the capacity to deliberate well in moral matters, but 'moral judgement' also means a particular moral judgement which is the result of one's deliberation, and which takes the form

of a proposition, which means that the everyday expression of moral judgement has two different meanings. Like in the case of the factual judgement, what we mean by 'moral judgement' as a particular moral judgement is the internal, mental, assertive act of formulating a claim to oneself in one's thoughts, which is made in a proposition, expressed by a sentence, as well as its external, linguistic, expression.

The fact that Aristotelian prudence and today's moral judgement as the capacity to make moral judgements build on different conceptions of morality implies that the meaning of today's everyday expression of moral judgement as the capacity to make moral judgements must be quite different from Aristotelian prudence, and therewith its moral judgements must differ from the Aristotelian moral judgements.

Unlike in Aristotle, prudence today, as the everyday use of the expression is understood by the author, is not directly connected to morality, which implies that in everyday language today, moral judgements differ from prudential judgements. The prudential judgement says what is good or bad for oneself, which means that it is an assessment of value which states that something is valuable or not, which is what we call a value judgement. Further the prudential judgement says what one should do to obtain this good or to avoid what is bad, which is what we call an action prescription. But since morality today demands only that one support others, not that one support oneself, unlike both the Aristotelian particular moral judgement and today's prudential judgement, today's particular moral judgement cannot say what is good or bad for oneself. Like in the case of the prudential judgement, the particular moral judgement too says what is good or bad, which means that a certain kind of value judgement forms part of the moral judgements, but these value judgements do not say what is good for the agent him- or herself, but instead what is good or bad in relation to others. This means that according to the way we use the expressions in daily language, moral value judgements are to be distinguished from prudential value judgements, which are non-moral value judgements.

Further, unlike the moral judgements made by Aristotelian prudence, today's moral judgements do not consist of action prescriptions only. According to Kaniak, a moral judgement is an opinion in moral matters about right and wrong concerning a certain physical, mental (thought or feeling) or linguistic act, and thus it says what is the

right or wrong thing to do, think, feel, or say.[110] And in his *Ethics. Inventing Right and Wrong*, Mackie says:

> A moral or ethical statement may assert that some particular action is right or wrong; or that actions or certain kinds are so; it may offer a distinction between good or bad characters or dispositions; or it may propound some broad principle from which many more detailed judgements of these sorts might be inferred – for example, that we ought always to aim at the greatest general happiness, or try to minimize the total suffering of all sentient beings, or devote ourselves wholly to the service of God, or that it is right and proper for everyone to look after himself.[111]

Certainly what Kaniak and Mackie say is true of the everyday expression of moral judgement. We have already noted that today's particular moral judgement says what is good or bad in relation to others, and this includes Mackie's claim that the moral statement says that a certain character type or disposition is good or bad, as well as the statement that a certain person is good or bad, or that humans have an absolute value. These statements are all in some way related to what is good or bad for others, since in everyday language the statement that a certain character type is good means that the person who has such a character is at least intending to promote the good of others, and the statement that a certain disposition is (morally) good means that the person has a disposition to promote the good of others, and consequently that a certain person is good means that he or she has good intentions, as we noted in Chapter 1 concerning goodness of the heart, and the statement that humans have an absolute value implies the conception that they have a right to (a good) life.

Like the value judgements which are forms of the moral judgements differ from those which are forms of the prudential judgements, the moral judgements which take the form of action prescriptions differ from those of the prudential judgements. Whereas prudential action prescriptions or rather recommendations say what one should do to obtain what is good for oneself, moral action prescriptions say what one should do so that others should obtain what is good. These action prescriptions can be generally held, like in 'One ought never to kill the innocent', or specific, as in 'You ought not to kill that man'. Since morality in the everyday sense of the word consists

[110] Kaniak, *Das vollkommene Urteil* pp. 35, 79.
[111] Mackie, *Ethics* p. 9.

of views concerning how human beings should treat each other only, the particular moral judgement concerns what the agent should do or not do to others, directly and indirectly, and what others should do or not do to the agent and to each other, but not what the agent or what others should or should not do to themselves. One single moral judgement can contain several kinds of action prescriptions, for several persons who are involved in the situation, and it can say that several persons are or are not to perform the same action. And it may prescribe not only what should be done right at the moment, but also what should be done later, in a longer perspective. But action prescriptions do not have to contain any information concerning why the action ought or ought not to be performed, or who is or is not to perform it ('Someone ought to stop that madman').

The various meanings of the everyday expression of moral judgement indicates that the process of making a moral judgement in everyday life is much more complex than Aristotle's description of moral judgement-making as simply drawing the correct conclusion from two premises. There may be many premises involved, dependent both on the kind of moral judgement and on the complexity of the situation and thus on the amount of morally relevant information available.

In the passage quoted above, Mackie also mentions the stating of moral principles as forms of moral statements. This is neither a value judgement concerning what is good or valuable or not, nor is it an action prescription, but instead a universal moral judgement, which claims something to be right or wrong, e.g. 'All killing is wrong'.

In addition to what Kaniak and Mackie mention, there are moral judgements which claim that people have rights, either generally, like in 'All children have the right to a childhood free from violence' or specifically, like in 'These men have a right to speak freely'.

If we now sum up what we have said concerning the nature of today's particular moral judgement, we may note that it makes a certain claim, either 'This is valuable/good/worthless/bad', 'This is right/wrong', 'All/they/he/she/none has a right to…', or 'This ought/ought not to be done'.

Expressions like 'I know that I shouldn't steal' or 'It is true that I ought to help him' might make one suspect that our everyday way of expressing ourselves concerning morality points to a value objectivism, the existence of absolute moral values, which

are assumed to exist through our use of language. This view of everyday language is defended by Mackie. Relating his position will make clear how everyday language does *not* function, which will point to how it actually functions concerning moral statements. This means that although Mackies claims concerning everyday language are false, they are still important to our discussion, and stressing where Mackie goes wrong will help making apparent the nature of everyday language concerning morality.

According to Mackie, in everyday life we mean to say how that what we want to characterise morally, for example a certain action, is in itself, or would be if realised, whether something is right or wrong in itself. Consequently moral statements made in everyday language are statements concerning what is good or bad, right or wrong absolutely, which assumes that objective values are part of the 'fabric of the world', as he calls it.[112] This means that according to Mackie, what we want to say is absolute; it is not contingent upon any desire or preference.

In his *Philosophy and Ordinary Language*, Hanfling rejects Mackie's analysis of our everyday uses of moral language:

> How should we understand the ontological commitments that Mackie ascribes to ordinary users of moral language? --- What is the fabric of the world? One might reply by reference to the materials of which it is made, such as rocks, metals, water, etc.; or, at a more analytic level, chemicals and molecules. But the idea that values could find a place in this company is bizarre and there is no reason to suppose that this is what people are committed to by their use of moral language, or that 'linguistic analysis' would reveal such a commitment. Here… the opponent of linguistic philosophy helps himself by foisting implausible metaphysical claims and theories on speakers of ordinary language. Having saddled them with such commitments, he points out that they are indeed unacceptable and concludes from this that a philosophy based on ordinary language is itself unreliable.[113]

We will here show that Hanfling is right, and we will do this by pointing at the differences between factual judgements and moral judgements according to the every-

[112] Mackie, *Ethics* p. 15.
[113] Hanfling, *Philosophy and Ordinary Language* p. 147.

day use of these expressions, and at the meaning of the everyday expressions 'truth' and 'good', as well as at the function and thus the aim of morality.

The factual judgement just states, for example, that someone is dead. It does not say whether it is good or bad that this someone is dead, and it does not say that something is right or wrong, nor that something ought or ought not to be done. The statements that it is good (or that it is bad) that x is dead, that it was right (or wrong) to kill him or her, and that someone ought (or ought not) to call an ambulance are all radically different from the statement that x is dead, according to our everyday semantic practice: The statement that someone is dead contains neither an evaluation, nor a prescription. According to our daily use of the expressions, 'values' and 'obligations' are both radically different from 'facts', since values and obligations are always either claimed, accepted, or rejected by someone, whereas facts are not necessarily either claimed, accepted, or rejected by anyone at all. Even if no human being ever makes a claim concerning a certain stone lying on the riverbank, it is still a fact that it lies there.

Further we have noted that in daily language, according to how the author understands the use of the everyday expression, we use the expression 'truth' in the meaning of something which is unchangeable, and therewith permanent, as in the example of Caesar being murdered by Brutus. But we do not use the everyday expression of moral judgement in this sense; it makes no sense to say that it would be true that all men are equal or that stealing is wrong even if mankind were to die out.

This indicates that a statement like 'All men are equal' is not a claim like the statement 'I am sitting in front of a computer': Whereas facts, according to our everyday use of the expression, are supposed to have an objective existence, an existence which is permanent and independent of their ever being noticed by any human being, the way we use the expressions 'value' and 'obligation' indicate that these are not supposed to have an objective existence: They must necessarily be claimed by someone, and they are not thought of as being permanent. This implies that although particular judgements which take the form of statements concerning values and obligations are often grammatically formulated like factual judgements, they are in fact used in the same way as opinions are, i.e., as personal, subjective views, what one thinks is good or bad, right or wrong, what someone has or does not have a right to, and what

one thinks ought or ought not to be done. This means that a moral judgement like 'You ought not to take his bike' is not a claim which says that it is eternally true that the other ought not to take that third person's bike, and that this is true independently of the existence of any human beings; it simply means that one has the opinion that the other ought not to take the third person's bike, an opinion which can be explained and thus motivated by the judge: The third person needs the bike, he will suffer if the other person takes it, etc.

The explanation for the difference between the factual judgement and the moral judgement concerning truth is to be found in the different functions of these judgements. The function of the factual judgement is expressing a knowledge about the world. The function of the particular moral judgement on the other hand is dependent on the function and therewith on the aim of morality, which is not the expression of knowledge, but which is practical, namely the mutual support of the members of a community.

Today the everyday meaning of the expression 'good' differs from the Aristotelian conception of the good referred to in Chapter 1, as being an absolute value with an objective existence. We have seen that in Aristotle's theory, the good man knows what is good absolutely, which means that Aristotle believes in the objective existence of moral values, and as we have noted, the objective existence of moral values implies that moral judgements are either true or false.

We have noted that morality prescribes good citizenship, which does not require knowledge of moral truths, but only a morally relevant knowledge, notably what the laws of the state and the current customs of society say. This means that unlike Aristotle's ethics, as it was described in the section on goodness in Chapter 1, morality does not presuppose the existence of objective values.

What we say in moral matters always relates to a certain conception of what is good and bad, right or wrong, a conception which consists of opinions which are based on what one thinks is important: life, happiness, freedom, etc.

In relation to the everyday expression of judgement, the expression 'true' is metaphysical in a way which 'good' is not: As we have seen, that a certain judgement is true means that it correctly singles out a material object or several objects, or a relation or several relations between objects. But according to the way we use the expres-

sion 'good' in everyday language today in relation to particular judgements, that a particular moral judgement is 'good' does not mean that it is 'true' in this sense; instead, a good moral judgement is a particular judgement which correctly applies morality either generally to human life or to a particular situation, which means that it corresponds both to morality and to certain morally relevant, true factual judgements.

We are raised to accept morality, and since morality prescribes usefulness to others, aiming at the mutual support of the members of a community, the fact that we are raised to accept morality means that we are raised to accept certain values which are related to what is useful to others. Accepting these values does not mean accepting that they have an objective existence of which one has knowledge, and that statements about them are necessarily either true or false; instead it means internalising the view that they should be realised in a life for others. 'It is wrong to steal!' is the way one talks to small children so that they internalise the *opinion* that one should not steal, so that in fact they do not perform the act of stealing. When uttering moral judgements to adults, one hardly presents one's opinion as a factual claim but as a personal view, an opinion, for which one gives a motivation. Thus instead of saying 'It is wrong to steal!', one says for example 'I think you should not take that thing from him, because it is all he has'. And if one says 'All men are equal', what one means is that one is of the opinion that all men should be treated as equals, i.e., with the same fairness, and that one wants others to share one's opinion. This is shown by the fact that more generally held moral judgements imply other moral judgements which are more specific: The value judgement that all men are equal implies the universal moral judgement that one ought to treat all men as equals, which implies the moral judgement that one ought to treat x as equal to y and z, for example. And as we have stated, the aim of morality is not the expression of knowledge, but moral acting, for which reason the function of all value judgements and universal moral judgements is to make the receiver of these uttered judgements internalise the importance of acting on certain action prescriptions.

This means that whereas according to the meaning of the everyday expression of factual judgement, it is semantically connected to the everyday expressions of truth and falsehood, according to the meaning of the everyday expression of moral judge-

ment, the moral judgement is not. This means that whereas uttering a factual judgement means stating a fact, uttering a moral judgement does not mean stating a fact. But against Bell, it still means making a claim, namely that something is good or valuable or not, that something is right or wrong, or that someone has or does not have a certain right, or that something ought or ought not to be done, although this claim is not true or false. And for this reason making a moral judgement is not a case of wondering, considering, imagining, or supposing, in which one neither asserts nor judges nor denies anything.

GOOD MORAL JUDGEMENT

According to our everyday use of the expression today, what is good in the moral sphere is simply what preserves the lives of human beings and what makes it possible for them to fulfil themselves and thus to obtain and to do what makes their lives worth living to them, and this is what morality prescribes. Of course what this means tends to vary between people depending on what they regard as being important to themselves, but in fact people tend to want much the same things; pleasant feelings of being content with life, experiencing oneself as being loved and appreciated by others, developing and exercising one's capacities and therewith cultivating one's interests, and experiencing that one's life makes sense, that it is meaningful. In Chapter 1 we noted that not only are we not always ourselves the best judges of what keeps us alive; furthermore, we are not even always the best judges of what makes our lives worth living, since we may have forgotten or simply neglect considering what is important to us, while others may be aware of this and being prepared to support us with it, and when we receive it, we feel joyful, relieved, satisfied, etc. Consequently what makes our lives worth living is dependent on our own reactions when we experience things.

Since morality demands the support of all other men, the good moral judgement aims at supporting all other individuals, and consequently, and as distinguished from Aristotle, it takes the good of all others into consideration, all who are involved in the situation, friends and acquaintances as well as strangers, and even enemies, and further all present and even all future members of society. Consequently the

good moral judgement tells one how to assist all persons involved in the actual situation, and supporting them can be done either directly, for example by helping another person who is about to drown, or indirectly, by providing all members of society with the means to their own self-fulfilment by supporting the preservation of their lives and their possibilities of making life worth living to themselves by removing obstacles to this aim, which is done by supporting the order and thus the stability and therewith the continuity of society. On the other hand, since morality allows for a minimal prudence, the good moral judgement does not clash with what such a minimal prudence recommends. This means that the good moral judgement does not prescribe assisting others at all costs; it does not prescribe heroic actions which include ruining or sacrificing one's own life. Instead, it prescribes actions which fulfil the criteria of good citizenship.

In the everyday expression of good moral judgement, 'good' is used in a technical sense, which means that the quality of the moral judgement, whether it is good or not, is independent of the agent's own judging, i.e., whether the agent has made the judgement him- or herself, or whether he or she has just accepted another person's judgement as his or her own. Simply repeating another person's moral judgement will not make this judgement worse, if only it applies morality either to human life in general or to a certain situation. Further the quality of the moral judgement is independent of the quality of the agent's own judging, i.e., his or her access to morally relevant information and his or her critical reflection based on this information, and thus of his or her morally relevant knowledge. This means that a moral judgement can be a good moral judgement accidentally, simply because it happens to apply morality to human life in general or to a specific situation. And finally, the good moral judgement is independent of the agent's intentions and thus of his or her reasons for judging or accepting a certain moral judgement as his or her own: If he or she correctly applies morality to human life in general or to a certain situation with the aim of benefiting him- or herself, then this does not make his or her moral judgement worse.

Most people's value judgements and universal moral judgements are vague and not fully conscious to them, which means that these moral judgements consist of unarticulated judgements which are more sensed than formulated in thought. These

vague moral opinions form the basis for people's moral judgements, and certainly such a vague, half-conscious moral opinion may well correctly apply morality either to human life in general or to an individual situation, in which case it is a good moral judgement. But is this the way we use the expression 'mature judgement' in everyday language?

We have now clarified the meaning of the expression 'good moral judgement' in daily language today, but it still remains to examine the meaning of the everyday expression 'mature judgement', and how it is related to the everyday expression good moral judgement. For being able to do this we will have to examine the nature of morally relevant knowledge.

MATURITY AND MORALLY RELEVANT KNOWLEDGE

We will now describe the semantic connection between the everyday expressions of maturity and of good moral judgement by showing that maturity allows for what we have chosen to call morally relevant knowledge, which is necessary for making good moral judgements which are not made accidentally. This and the moral motivation implied by maturity semantically connects maturity to morality.

Maturity makes one able to behave in ways appropriate for adults, which means fulfilling one's role in society, which means taking one's responsibility as a member of the community, which means acting in ways which are useful to others, which means supporting their good. This means fulfilling certain basic moral demands which means that the action is morally acceptable, that it is not blameworthy. A morally relevant knowledge must tell one how to realise this aim.

We have seen that Mackie's claims in *Ethics. Inventing Right and Wrong* concerning our use of language show what the function of morality is *not*, which gives important clues to what it is. Mackie says:

> Someone [who] is in a state of moral perplexity, wondering whether it would be wrong for him to engage, say, in research related to bacteriological warfare, wants to arrive at some judgement about this concrete case, his doing this work at this time in these actual circumstances; his relevant characteristics will be part of the subject of the judgement, but no relation between him and the proposed action will be part of

> the predicate. The question is not, for example, whether he really wants to do this work, whether it will satisfy or dissatisfy him, whether he will in the wrong run have a pro-attitude towards it, or even whether this is an action of a sort that he can happily and sincerely recommend in all relevantly similar cases. Nor is he even wondering just whether to recommend such action in all relevantly similar cases. He wants to know whether this course of action would be wrong in itself.[114]

But certainly a scientist who asks himself whether it would be wrong for him to engage in research related to bacteriological warfare does not want to know whether this is wrong in itself, he wants to know what to *do* in this situation. The aim of our everyday moral deliberation is not to obtain knowledge of objective moral values, and thus it is not to find out what is good or bad, right or wrong in itself; instead, everyday moral deliberation is an activity which aims at finding solutions to actual moral problems in daily life. We want to come to a decision concerning what to do, and our decision we base on factual judgements in the everyday sense which we have reason to believe to be true: If I do this research then it might be dangerous for a lot many people, but if I don't, my career as a scientist may be over, etc., as well as on our own moral views, e.g.: I do not think one should endanger the lives of other people, even if these people are unknown to oneself.

In Chapter 1 we noted that as distinguished from Aristotle, being a good citizen, according to the way we use the expression in daily language, does not require knowledge of moral truths, of what is good or bad, right or wrong absolutely, only of what is required of one as a member of society, which is what the law and the more important customs prescribe. We also noted that morality prescribes good citizenship, which means that morality does not assume a value objectivism and knowledge of moral truths. In this chapter we have noted that whereas the everyday expression 'factual judgement' is semantically connected to the everyday expression 'truth', the everyday expression 'moral judgement' is not.

The correct expression for knowledge of objectively existing moral values and therefore of what is good or bad, right or wrong as such would be 'moral knowledge', but this is not the way we express ourselves in our everyday semantic practice: We do

[114] Mackie, *Ethics* pp. 33-34.

not say that we have 'moral knowledge', and we do not say that we 'know' what is good or bad, right or wrong *as such*. Such a claim to knowledge would equal a claim to knowledge of what is in a certain desk drawer. We can doubt that someone knows what is in the desk drawer by saying that he hasn't checked, he is only guessing, but we would not say that someone does not know what is good or bad, right or wrong because he has not checked it, and therefore he is only guessing. According to our everyday language, there is proof of what is in the desk drawer, namely through sense perception, but there is no *proof* of what is good or bad, right or wrong. Instead of saying that we have moral knowledge, we say that we have knowledge *of morality*, which means something quite different. In everyday language, with the expression 'morality' we mean a system of views concerning what ought to be done so as to serve the mutual support of the members of a community, namely that each member of society fulfils his or her role by supporting others with whom he or she has direct intercourse as well as the stability and thus permanence of society for the sake of all its present and future members. Consequently morality prescribes support, direct and indirect, of all other members of society. This means that 'knowledge of morality' means knowledge of a certain moral conception, a certain moral view or opinion, and when we say that we know what is good or bad, right or wrong, we use the expression 'knowledge' in this sense, i.e., as knowledge of moral views which we accept ourselves. Consequently when we say 'I know what is right' or 'I know what I ought to do', we do not make any metaphysical claims; instead we confirm our knowledge of and acceptance of a certain moral convention.

Such knowledge builds on true beliefs concerning the existence of certain moral views. Beliefs build on factual judgements, which means that knowledge of moral views builds on true factual judgements concerning the existence of certain moral views. 'Knowing that what one does is wrong' thus means knowing that what one does is wrong according to a certain kind of morality, and accepting this as valid for oneself. The expression 'It's true that I ought not to steal' has the same meaning as 'I ought not to steal', namely that stealing is prohibited according to a certain moral view which one accepts as being valid for oneself. By formulating the claim either internally, to oneself, or by uttering the expression, one thereby confirms to oneself

that one has this view, of which one might not have been fully aware a while ago when being a victim to the temptation of stealing.

Accepting something as valid for oneself means finding it correct not in the sense of being true, but in the sense of being good. In the last section we noted that the everyday expression 'good' is not metaphysical in the sense which the expression 'true' is, and that the fact that a moral judgement is 'good' means not that it is true, but that it correctly applies morality either generally to human life or to a particular situation. Likewise, finding something correct in the sense of being good means not holding this something to be true, but instead it means accepting it as being imperative.

What we have now said implies that the good moral judgement according to the way we use the expression in everyday language builds not on knowledge of objectively existing moral values, but on knowledge of morality. In addition it builds on knowledge of the situation and of society as a whole. This knowledge we can call a morally relevant knowledge, and thus a good moral judgement made by the agent himself which is not made accidentally implies morally relevant knowledge in this sense.

Not only knowledge of morality builds on true beliefs, in this case concerning the content of morality, beliefs which are based on true factual judgements; knowledge of the situation and of society as a whole too builds on true beliefs, and thus on true factual judgements, which means that morally relevant knowledge as a whole does, which indicates that morally relevant knowledge ultimately builds on sense perception. Knowledge through sense perception of course does not assume a value objectivism, since sense perceptions are the basis for factual judgements only, and factual judgements, as we have seen, do not contain statements about values.

Morally relevant knowledge is based on true beliefs due to having made certain true factual judgements of moral relevance. Morally relevant, true factual judgements are judgements which provide the agent with a knowledge of the different aspects of the situation and of how these aspects are connected, which gives an overview of the moral situation, and it also gives an insight in how the situation at hand relates to other situations. This shows which possibilities are offered, and thus the different alternatives for action, and thus what can be done and by whom, as well as which actions will serve to realise a certain aim. This requires being able to distin-

guish and compare and thus assess the importance of things, above all the effects of actions on the people concerned. This means that the acquisition of morally relevant knowledge requires critical reflection on all or most relevant information concerning the situation at hand and the persons involved, what preserves their lives and what makes their lives worth living to themselves, presently as well as in a longer time perspective, and what they are doing presently and what they intend to do next, what they are capable of doing and what they are prepared to do.

The condition that a good moral judgement which is not made accidentally must rest on sufficient morally relevant knowledge, of morality, of the situation at hand, and of society as a whole, may seem to make the correctness of the good moral judgement relative, so that it is only correct to speak of a moral judgement as being better or worse in relation to other moral judgements which are less/more informed. But although there is no end to the information one can gather about a certain situation, not everything which there is to know is morally relevant, and in the end only a few factors are of special importance, and that a moral judgement is good simply means that it correctly applies morality to life in general or to an individual situation. This requires only a moral judgement which is sufficient towards the background of the morally relevant information immediately available. In many cases making a quick decision is more important than making one which takes all morally relevant information into consideration.

Maturity as an autonomy which is formed by a universal sympathy implies rationality in the everyday sense of being appropriate, i.e., adapted, suited, to its purpose. Therewith it implies reflection, on what is demanded of one and of what one must do to fulfil these demands, which means that it requires the capacity to make correct assessments of priorities and thus a certain understanding of these priorities, of who is in most need of support in the situation and of which action best serves the purpose of supporting the person who is in most need of help. This means that maturity secures a competence in making good moral judgements which are not good accidentally, which means that they build on morally relevant knowledge. This implies that maturity supports the acquisition of morally relevant knowledge. This knowledge tells one how best to realise one's good intentions, i.e., with the least effort, with

the least risk of injury, and with the highest chance of success, which allows for making moral judgements which can lay claim to a certain rationality.

The reason for the fact that maturity secures competent moral judgement-making is to be found in the universal sympathy on which the morally relevant autonomy is based, which corresponds to the meaning of our everyday expression of maturity. Universal sympathy makes the lives of others and the fact that their lives are worth living to them important to one, which makes living according to morality important to one. This motivates one to turn towards the situation and towards society as a whole in attention and concentration with the aim of understanding morally relevant aspects which are needed for making a good moral judgement, which is one which points to an action or actions which fulfils or fulfil the demands of morality. This means that universal sympathy, as we have chosen to call it, motivates the agent to strive to obtain morally relevant knowledge, and further to judging on the basis of this knowledge, and to acting accordingly. This function of universal sympathy is fulfilled by the affirmative mental attitude and the friendly feelings included, which were described in Chapter 2. The everyday expression 'friendly feeling', which means a feeling of joy at human intercourse, is semantically connected to the everyday expression 'affirmative attitude' in the meaning of a certain mental attitude, and the everyday meanings of these two expressions indicate that the friendly feelings are connected to a mental attitude of interest in the other for his sake, and thus to concern for the other, and the everyday meaning of 'concern' indicates a direction of the mind of attention and concentration towards the object, the other person.

The feelings can improve one's morally relevant perception: By giving rise to mental attitudes which focus our attention on a certain object, our feelings can make us more receptive to certain kinds of external stimuli which influence our sense perception, so that we, when experiencing a certain feeling in a certain situation, perceive things which we would not have perceived without this feeling experience. By giving rise to concern for others, one's friendly feelings support the perception of morally relevant aspects of reality, for example concerning the vulnerability of human beings, which gives a morally relevant knowledge, for example that a certain person is in danger and thus in need of aid.

Our feelings are necessary for evaluating something as being important, although the evaluation itself must be made by the intellect. According to Steinfath, only through the feelings do we put something external in relation to ourselves, in experiencing that this something has a certain importance to us. Fear for example is necessary for experiencing a danger as being directly related to oneself. This function can be filled neither by views, nor by wishes. Views and wishes become *my* views and wishes only when I experience feelings related to them. In feeling something I am inexchangeable; we cannot share feelings with others in the same way as we can share views.[115]

Something can be said to be important to us simply because we react with certain feelings which make us assume an affirming/rejecting attitude towards the object. But the feelings also make one interpret things as important or as unimportant.

One's feelings motivate one to make use of one's knowledge in sorting and classifying one's perceptions as part of one's overall experience, and they motivate one to make factual judgements based on one's interpretation of one's perceptions. This means that the feelings are necessary for the forming of beliefs concerning the world. And since knowledge of the world rests on true beliefs concerning the world, the feelings are necessary for the acquisition of knowledge of the world, and thus for the acquisition of morally relevant knowledge.

It seems obvious that through our upbringing we learn to experience certain feelings as a response to our interpretation of certain stimuli and in the context of certain beliefs and also of certain moral views which we learn to accept. We experience certain feelings when we judge that moral norms which we accept as correct in the meaning of being valid have been either respected or disrespected. This means that our emotional reactions make us attentive to when moral demands which we accept as valid have been violated, as well as when they have been fulfilled, and this means that if one has internalised, learned to accept as valid, the demands of morality, one's feelings can indicate to one when morality has been respected or disrespected in judgement and in action. This means that the feelings help one in the process of making good moral judgements.

[115] Steinfath, *Orientierung am Guten* pp. 117, 121.

The feelings must always be interpreted by the intellect for providing the agent with any kind of knowledge. Such an interpretation can be very simple, like becoming aware of the situation in which one experiences a certain feeling and comparing this situation with earlier situations. This means comparing one's feelings with other mental phenomena: with memories of earlier interpretations of feeling experiences, with mental attitudes, wishes, beliefs, views, and judgements. Since the feelings must always be interpreted, we cannot assume that they can give knowledge themselves.

The feelings and the mental attitudes in combination have a tendency to raise wishes. According to Steinfath, feeling experiences can give orientation in the direction of a certain way of acting if they casually lead to wishes or imply wishes conceptually.[116]

Feelings and attitudes alone give rise only to the simple wish to obtain the object or to avoid it. But together with other mental phenomena: beliefs, views, and judgements, feelings and mental attitudes can raise also more complex wishes.

The affirmative mental attitude of concern for others is an interest in others for their sake, which means that the agent's personal wishes, i.e., wishes to satisfy him- or herself, have been replaced by wishes to support others for their sake. This serves to improve one's morally relevant perception, since the fact that one is observing the situation with the aim of supporting others makes one accept the information one receives without intently overlooking certain aspects or colouring one's interpretation due to personal wishes. This is what we call matter-of-factness in daily language, and it supports the making of morally relevant, true factual judgements which provide one with morally relevant knowledge.

The mature man's or woman's feelings and mental attitude are such feelings and such a mental attitude which motivate him or her to accept morality as being valid for him- or herself, and which support his or her moral judgement-making, that is, which support the process of making morally relevant, true factual judgements which give the moral knowledge needed for making good moral judgements, and which further motivate to making good moral judgements and acting on them. The feelings and the mental attitude which best satisfy these requirements are those which we mean when we use the everyday expression 'sympathy' in a universal

[116] Steinfath, *Orientierung am Guten* p. 190.

sense: friendly feelings, which take the form of pleasant feelings without intensity, namely as joy at the company of others, and the affirmative mental attitude of concern for others. The friendly feelings and the concern for others provide the agent with psychological skills: They stimulate one's capacity for imagining the psychological lives of others, their needs, their wishes, and their intentions, and what they are capable of doing and what they are prepared to do, and they also improve one's capacity for imagining alternatives of action which satisfy the needs of wishes of others and thus what makes their lives worth living to them, which is what morality aims at.

We have seen that the good moral judgement made by the mature man or woman cannot be either true or false, but only 'good' in the sense of successfully applying morality to life in general or to an individual situation. We might find this conclusion dissatisfying, since we might expect more from a mature person's moral judgement than just a technical goodness, goodness as efficiency, namely in applying morality, and one might ask oneself why there is talk of mature judgements at all in daily language, instead of just of good moral judgements. What is so special with the mature judgement if maturity cannot guarantee knowledge of truth in moral matters?

The answer is to be found in the everyday expression 'objectivity'. The semantic connection between the everyday expressions 'mature judgement' and 'objectivity' with regard to the expression 'moral judgement' will be the topic of the next section of our study.

MATURE JUDGEMENT

We have noted that the everyday expression 'maturity' is used in connection with intellectual development, which means that what is mature or immature is a human mind. But we also use the expression 'mature' for certain kinds of moral judgements, as well as for certain actions.

We have noted that maturity secures good citizenship, which may make one suspect that what we call a 'mature judgement' in everyday language today is simply a good moral judgement, one which tells one how to correctly apply morality to life in general or to an individual situation by stating what is good or bad, right or wrong,

certain rights or the absence of rights, or what ought or ought not to be done, whereas a 'mature action' is a morally good action, namely one which fulfils the demands of morality, and which thus realises the good moral judgement in practical action, which means that it is useful to other people, either directly or indirectly. But we will see that it is not quite that simple.

The fact that maturity secures good citizenship does not mean that it is identical with good citizenship. As we have seen, for being a good citizen it is enough simply to act well, and thereby to fulfil one's role in society, but this is not enough for maturity.

Since maturity secures good citizenship, a mature judgement must be one which tells one how to fulfil one's role in society, of taking one's responsibility as a member of the community, which means fulfilling certain basic moral demands, and consequently that the action prescribed is morally good in the limited sense of being morally acceptable, of not being blameworthy. But as distinguished from good citizenship, maturity implies making good moral judgements of one's own which are not made accidentally, which means that they are based on morally relevant knowledge. The fact that the good moral judgement can be made accidentally, but the mature man's or woman's particular moral judgement cannot, means that although it too is a good moral judgement in the everyday sense of the word, it still differs from the standard good moral judgement: The mature judgement is a good moral judgement of a certain kind, one which fulfils other criteria than just applying morality to human life in general or to an individual situation.

As already mentioned, the mature judgement must build on morally relevant knowledge, which implies that it must be made in a certain way, namely in full consciousness of what one is doing. Further, and as distinguished from the good moral judgement, the mature judgement must be made by the agent him- or herself, i.e., it will not do just to accept another person's moral judgement as one's own. And the mature judgement must be based on the agent's own good intentions, i.e., intentions to live according to morality for the sake of others instead of for the sake of oneself or partly for the sake of oneself, which means that whether a moral judgement is to be considered mature or not is dependent on the agent's reasons for his or her judging.

In addition, the mature judgement can be sufficiently explained and thus motivated by the judge him- or herself, and it always remains preliminary while revisable in the face of new and relevant information. We will now show that these criteria on the mature judgement can be summed up as a criterion of objectivity in the everyday sense of that word.

In Baillie's interpretation of Hume, moral judgements can be objective in the sense that they can be made by any competent person. This is a criterion of intersubjectivity.[117] Likewise, according to the way we use the expression objectivity in everyday language, an objective moral judgement can be checked and found correct by several competent moral judges. This means that at least in theory, everyone who is capable of good moral deliberation, i.e., of making morally relevant, true factual judgements and of applying morality to the morally relevant knowledge which is based on true beliefs founded on these true factual judgements, is able to make the same moral judgement, which would mean that this moral judgement is an objective moral judgement.

Maturity gives the competence to live according to morality, which means making mature judgements and acting on them, and as we have seen, mature judgements are good moral judgements, which are moral judgements which correctly apply morality either to life in general or to individual situations. But it is questionable whether all mature men and women according to the way in which we use the expression maturity in daily language today would make the same moral judgement in an actual problem situation.

The meaning of the everyday expression of morality as it is used in daily language changes with the times and with the current culture, which means that the meanings of the expressions 'moral' and 'immoral' change, and consequently the meanings of the expressions 'good' and 'right' do, but we have reason to believe that in all cultures there is a certain conception of maturity which implies moral competence, whatever the current morality says, and that this moral competence secures good citizenship. And certainly the fact that for men and women in a certain culture it can be impossible to come to a certain conclusion morally because it is too far from their

[117] Baillie, *Hume on Morality* p. 197.

way of thinking does not mean that there are no mature men and women in that society.

Further morality today can be correctly applied in different ways to the same situation, depending on the judge's interpretation of the situation. All men have an individual personality and a unique life history with unique experiences, for which reason people's perception and their interpretations of their perception differs. This means that different mature men and women will interpret a certain situation differently, which means that their moral judgements will differ. This means that not only will mature men and women in different cultures differ in their moral judgements; even mature persons belonging to the same culture will occasionally come to different conclusions concerning what is good, what is right, which rights people have and which they do not have, and what should be done. Thus, and against Aristotle, two mature persons may well make different moral judgements, which both satisfy the conditions for being mature judgements.

This seems to indicate that the mature judgement cannot lay claim to objectivity, according to the way we use the expression 'objectivity' in everyday language. But if we examine the everyday use of the expression in relation to the expression 'moral judgement', we will find that a moral judgement can fulfil the criteria for objectivity also in other ways.

Like in the case with the expression maturity, it may be easier to start by noting what objectivity in relation to moral judgement in everyday language does *not* mean. First of all, we would not use the expression of objectivity concerning a moral judgement if the end product, the linguistic claim, is vague, i.e., not clearly formulated. And further, we would not use the expression of objectivity concerning a moral judgement if the moral judgement prescribed actions which were not demanded by morality, in which case it would not fulfil its purpose, which is to give guidelines concerning the fulfilment of morality. Thirdly, we would not use the expression of objectivity concerning a moral judgement if it took only certain persons into regard, in which case it would be partial, and morality according to the way we use the expression in everyday language demands that all persons are taken into regard when acting.

But objectivity concerning a moral judgement also seems to demand that certain requirements concerning the making of the moral judgement are fulfilled. We may note that 'objectivity' concerning moral judgements is used in much the same way as 'reliability' is. A judgement which is reliable is one which can be trusted, and it can be trusted for the simple reason that it was made in a way which gives good reason to assume it to be correct in the meaning of correctly applying morality to an individual situation or to life in general. An objective moral judgement is reliable in this way, which means that there are reasons to trust it, reasons which can be explained and motivated.

But objectivity in this sense concerning moral judgements is also not compatible with a lack of active participation on the part of the agent. A moral judgement, however 'correct' in the meaning of realising the aims of morality when acted on, cannot be said to be objective if made by another person and just accepted by the agent as being correct without him or her checking its validity by means of critical reflection. And if he or she does check its validity and finds it to be correct, then in fact he or she is making the moral judgement anew, which is quite another thing than just mechanically repeating what another person has said. Further we would not use the expression of objectivity concerning a moral judgement which was made accidentally by the agent, without building on enough morally relevant knowledge, and which thus cannot be sufficiently explained and thus motivated by the judge. Such a judgement we would not claim to be a reliable judgement. And we would not use the expression of objectivity concerning a moral judgement which was not done intently and willingly by the agent, in which case he or she might pursue quite other aims with his or her judgement-making than that of realising the aims of morality. Consequently we would not use the expression of objectivity concerning a moral judgement if it did not build on good intentions on the part of the agent but instead on selfish intentions, which would mean that the agent's moral judgement-making was based on a subjective motivation, namely to support him- or herself. And finally we would not use the expression of objectivity concerning a moral judgement if it was not changed in the face of new and relevant information, in which case too it would not prove reliable.

Having now clarified what objectivity concerning a moral judgement does not mean in everyday language, we have some clues to the everyday meaning of objectivity. From the negative description of objectivity in the everyday sense in connection with moral judgement given above we can deduce that according to our everyday semantic practice, the objective moral judgement in the everyday sense, as being a good moral judgement of a certain kind, 1) says that something is either good or bad, right or wrong, that someone has or does not have certain rights, or that something ought or ought not to be done, 2) is clearly formulated, 3) prescribes only what morality demands, 4) takes all persons into regard, 5) is made by the agent him- or herself, either originally or anew by critically examining and accessing the validity of another person's judgement, 6) is made in full consciousness of what one is doing, which means that it is based on morally relevant knowledge and thus on sufficient relevant information in the form of morally relevant, true factual judgements, 7) can be sufficiently explained and thus motivated by the judge, 8) is done intently and willingly, i.e., as the result of critical reflection and choice, 9) builds on the agent's own good intentions, which means that it aims at supporting both other individuals for their sake as well as society as a whole for the sake of all its members, and 10) remains preliminary while revisable in the face of new and relevant information.

This gives at hand that the everyday meaning of 'mature judgement' corresponds to the everyday meaning of 'objective moral judgement', which means that according to the way we use the expression 'mature judgement' in everyday language, it has a certain objectivity while being reliable, in spite of the fact that it is neither true nor false, and in spite of the fact that different mature men and women can come to different conclusions concerning what is right or wrong morally.

This means that although mature persons will on occasion differ in their mature judgements, mature judgements can still be said to allow for a certain, although limited, objectivity. This means that the mature judgement is a moral judgement which can be trusted, and that even persons who are not themselves mature can well understand that they may safely trust these moral judgements, which is not the case with moral judgements which are just good, since as we have seen these may well be just repeated from what another person has said, they may be accidental, and motivated by selfish strivings, they may not be made intently and willingly, they may not

take all persons into regard, and they may be vague and the agent may not be able to explain them thoroughly.

According to Raphael, disagreement in moral judgement suggests that we do not know for certain what we ought to do.[118] But this must not be the case. The mature judgement can always be trusted, even if contradicted by another mature judgement, and since both are correct, both ought to be acted on. On the other hand, although it may well be that two mature persons, even from the same culture, come to different conclusions concerning what is good, what is right, which rights there are, or what ought to be done, still, as Hanfling rightly points out,

> It is no accident that concepts are shared, to a large extent, by different societies; they are part of the human condition, reflecting the needs and interests of human beings living in a social world.[119]

And he says:

> To a large extent… our concepts – especially those of interest to philosophers – are bound up with essential human situations: they are part of the human 'form of life'.[120]

Since the conceptions of morality in different cultures tend to show certain similarities, for the simple reason that there are some basic human needs and thus preferences which will always remain the same over the ages, above all to go on living and to engage in activities which make one's life worth living, and since the conception of maturity, whatever this conception is called in the individual culture, always is understood as giving a moral competence, the moral judgements of mature men and women even from different cultures will still show a certain similarity.

MATURE ACTION

We noted earlier that not only is a human being called mature or immature, and what we call mature or immature here is a human mind; but we also use the expressions 'mature' and 'immature' for moral judgements and for actions. And we asked

[118] Raphael, *Moral Judgement* p. 152.
[119] Hanfling, *Philosophy and Ordinary Language* p. 72.
[120] ibid. p. 11.

whether, according to the way we use the expression 'mature action' in daily language, a mature action is identical with a morally good action.

The case of mature action is easier than that of the mature judgement, since a mature action is simply an action prescribed by a certain mature judgement. This distinguishes the mature action from one which is merely morally good, since a morally good action is one which is pointed out by a good moral judgement, which simply means that it fulfils the demands of morality. A mature action on the other hand is not just an action which fulfils the demands of morality; the everyday meaning of the expression 'mature action' indicates that such an action requires certain criteria other than just being morally good, which are the conditions of mature judgement-making. This means that whereas a man or woman who acts on the mature judgement without having made this moral judgement him- or herself acts well, he or she does not act maturely. This means that only mature men and women can judge and act 'maturely' in the strict sense, although of course anyone can act on the mature person's moral judgement.

For Aristotle in the *Nicomachean Ethics*, understanding the conclusion in the practical syllogism means not only intellectually understanding what should be done, but also being actively disposed to performing the act, i.e. understanding the conclusion forces one to act. But we have noted that Aristotelian prudence gives guidelines only concerning the agent's own acting, whereas the mature man or woman according to our everyday use of the expression is also able to act as a moral advisor to others. And in many cases in daily life, it may be *impossible* for the competent moral judge to act according to his or her own judgement, even though it would be good for him- or herself if he or she would do so: he or she cannot make a try because he or she lacks the means – physical or mental strength (energy, courage etc.) the money necessary, and so on. This is not seldom the case in good moral advice given by old or sick people. And in fact in many cases it will not even be good for the advisor him- or herself to live in the way he or she prescribes. He or she may come to a conclusion concerning right action which is recommendable to others, but which would be devastating for him- or herself. Here we must distinguish between immediately good for the person himself, good for the person himself in the longer perspective, immediately good for others, and good for others in the longer perspective. A good advice is always

good for the receiver of the advice, either immediately or in the long perspective. The mature man or woman strives to support others either directly, through his or her own acting, or indirectly, either by supporting society as a whole, or by acting as a moral advisor to others, and the person who in a certain situation is most able to fulfil the demands of morality is the person who rightly should act, which must not be the mature man or woman him- or herself.

Bibliography

Alston, William P.: *Self-Intervention and the Structure of Motivation*. In Theodore Mischel (ed.): *The Self. Psychological and Philosophical Issues*. Basil Blackwell, Oxford 1977

Aristotle: *The Ethics of Aristotle*. *The Nicomachean Ethics*. Tr. J.A.K. Thomson, rev. Hugh Tredennick. Penguin Books, London 1976

Aristotle: *The Nicomachean Ethics*. (Greek/English.) The Loeb Classical Library. William Heinemann Ltd., London & Harvard University Press, Cambridge 1947

Aristotle: *Politik*. Tr. Franz Susemihl, rev. Nelly Tsouyopoulos, Ernesto Grassi. Rowohlt Taschenbuch Verlag, Reinbek bei Hamburg 1994

Aristotle: *Aristotelis Politica*. (Greek.) W.D. Ross (ed.). Clarendon Press, Oxford 1962

Austin, J.L.: *Philosophical Papers*. J.O. Urmson, G.J. Warnock (eds.). Clarendon Press, Oxford 1970

Baillie, James: *Hume on Morality*. Routledge, London 2000

Barnes, Jonathan: *Introduction*. In *The Ethics of Aristotle*. *The Nicomachean Ethics*. Tr. J.A.K. Thomson, rev. Hugh Tredennick. Penguin Books, London 1976

Bell, David: *Frege's Theory of Judgement*. Clarendon Press, Oxford 1979

Berofsky, Bernard: *Identification, the Self, and Autonomy*. In Ellen Frankel Paul, Fred D. Miller, Jr., Jeffrey Paul: *Autonomy*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2003

Blasi, Augusto: *Autonomie im Gehorsam. Die Entwicklung des Distanzierungsvermögens im sozialisierten Handeln*. In Wolfgang Edelstein, Jürgen Habermas (eds.): *Soziale Interaktion und soziales Verstehen. Beiträge zur Entwicklung der Interaktionskompetenz*. Suhrkamp Verlag, Frankfurt am Main 1984

Coan, Richard W.: *Hero, Artist, Sage, or Saint? A Survey of Views on what is Variously Called Mental Health, Normality, Maturity, Self-actualization, and Human Fulfillment*. Columbia University Press, New York 1977

Cooper, John M.: *Stoic Autonomy*. In Ellen Frankel Paul, Fred D. Miller, Jr., Jeffrey Paul: *Autonomy*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2003

Den Uyl, Douglas: *Autonomous Autonomy: Spinoza on Autonomy, Perfectionism, and Politics*. In Ellen Frankel Paul, Fred D. Miller, Jr., Jeffrey Paul: *Autonomy*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2003

Dostoyevsky, Fyodor: *The Idiot*. Wordsworth, Ware 1996

Erikson, Erik H.: *Childhood and Society*. 2nd ed. W.W. Norton & Company, New York 1963

Flanagan, Owen: *Self Expressions. Mind, Morals, and the Meaning of Life*. Oxford University Press, New York & Oxford 1996

Garz, Detlef: *Lawrence Kohlberg zur Einführung*. Junius, Hamburg 1996

Habermas, Jürgen: *Erläuterungen zur Diskursethik*. Suhrkamp Verlag, Frankfurt am Main 1991

Hanfling, Oswald: *Philosophy and Ordinary Language. The Bent and Genius of our Tongue*. Routledge, London 2000

Hume, David: *A Treatise of Human Nature*. 2nd ed. Oxford University Press, Oxford 1978

Isocrates: *Panathenaicus*. Tr. Terry L. Papillon. In *The Oratory of Classical Greece*, vol. 7: *Isocrates II*. University of Texas Press, Austin 2004

Isocrates: *Panathenaicus.* Greek. In Basilius G. Mandilaras (ed.): *Isocrates Opera omnia* vol. III. K.G. Saur Verlag, München & Leipzig 2003

Jacobs, Jonathan: *Some Tensions Between Autonomy and Self-governance*. In Ellen Frankel Paul, Fred D. Miller, Jr., Jeffrey Paul: *Autonomy*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2003

Johnstone, Henry W., Jr.: *The Problem of the Self*. Pennsylvania State University Press, University Park & London 1970

Kaniak, Gustav: *Das vollkommene Urteil*. Manzsche Verlags- und Universitätsbuchhandlung, Wien 1987

Kant, Immanuel: *Grundlegung zur Metaphysik der Sitten*. Werke in sechs Bänden, vol. III. Könemann Verlagsgesellschaft, Köln 1995

Kohlberg, Lawrence: *The Philosophy of Moral Development. Moral Stages and the Idea of Justice*. Harper & Row Publishers, San Francisco 1981

Kupfer, Joseph H.: *Autonomy and Social Interaction.* State University of New York Press, Albany 1990

Loevinger, Jane, with the assistance of Augusto Blasi: *Ego Development: Conceptions and Theories*. Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Francisco, Washington, London 1976

Mackie, J. L.: *Ethics. Inventing Right and Wrong*. Penguin Books, Harmondsworth 1978

Mischel, Walter & Harriet N. Mischel: *Self-control and the Self*. In Theodore Mischel (ed.): *The Self. Psychological and Philosophical Issues*. Basil Blackwell, Oxford 1977

Oshana, Marina: *How Much Should We Value Autonomy?* In Ellen Frankel Paul, Fred D. Miller, Jr., Jeffrey Paul: *Autonomy*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2003

Raphael, D. Daiches: *Moral Judgement*. George Allen & Unwin, London 1955

Sophocles: *Antigone*. In Sophocles vol. II: *Antigone, The Women of Trachis, Philoctetes, Oedipus at Colonus*. Tr. Hugh Lloyd-Jones. The Loeb Classical Library. Harvard University Press, Cambridge & London 2002

Sophocles: *Antigone.* Greek. Mark Griffith (ed.) The Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1999

Steinfath, Holmer: *Orientierung am Guten. Praktisches Überlegen und die Konstitution von Personen*. Suhrkamp Verlag, Frankfurt am Main 2001

Xenophon: *The Spartan Constitution*. Greek/English. In Michael Lipka: *Xenophon's Spartan Constitution. Introduction, Text, Commentary*. Walter de Gruyter, Berlin 2002

Zusammenfassung
in deutscher Sprache

In unseren alltäglichen Gesprächen über Moral kommen die Ausdrücke „reif“ und „unreif“ auffallend häufig vor. Nicht nur sagen wir, eine gewisse Person, ein gewisses Urteil oder eine Handlungsweise sei „gut“ oder „schlecht“, sondern auch, sie/es sei „reif“ oder „unreif“. Interessanterweise gibt es noch keine eigentlich philosophische Forschung zur Klärung des Begriffs der Reife und seiner Relevanz für die Moral, trotz seiner offensichtlichen Aktualität und Relevanz im alltäglichen moralischen Denken.

In dieser Arbeit werden die verschiedenen Bedeutungen des alltäglichen Ausdrucks der Reife sowohl als die anderer verwandten Ausdrücke analysiert: „Moral“, „Sympathie“, „Autonomie“ und „reifes Urteil“. Die Alltagsbedeutungen der Ausdrücke, die durch den alltäglichen Gebrauch bestimmt werden, werden in der Arbeit Common Sense genannt. Diese Methode erinnert an die des sog. „ordinary language philosophy“, der Philosophie der Alltagssprache der Oxforder Schule der 50er und 60er Jahre, aber im Unterschied zur Oxfordschule wird in dieser Arbeit kein Versuch unternommen, mit den Mitteln des „ordinary language philosophy“ philosophische Probleme zu lösen. Stattdessen bietet die Analyse eine Grundlegung der philosophischen Arbeit an den Begriff der Reife durch eine Analyse dessen Bedeutung und moralische Relevanz in der Alltagssprache, weshalb diese Studie nicht im strengen Sinne als eine Arbeit in der Tradition des „ordinary language philosophy“ betrachtet werden kann.

Die Klärung dieser fünf Alltagsausdrücke und deren sprachlogischen Beziehungen erlaubt ein tieferes Verständnis für die Art und Weise wie wir diese Ausdrücke benutzen, sowohl als für ihre Relevanz in unserer täglichen moralischen Praxis. Dazu können Analysen des Common Sense unser alltägliches Denken und Sprechen über Moral beeinflussen, zugunsten größerer Genauigkeit, was die Alltagsbedeutungen der Ausdrücke selber verändern würde.

„Reife" bedeutet in der Alltagssprache ein geistiges Erwachsensein. Wir beurteilen die Reife eines Menschen ausgehend von seinem Urteilen und seinem Handeln, und was wir damit beurteilen ist sein inneres Leben: „Reife" wird mit intellektueller und emotionaler Entwicklung in Verbindung gebracht, und was wir im Menschen als reif oder als unreif beurteilen ist sein Bewusstsein, mit dem wir eine gewisse Art des Überlegens, Fühlens und Wünschens assoziieren.

Wir nennen aber auch einzelne Urteile und Handlungen „reif" oder „unreif". Ein reifes Bewusstsein zeigt sich im Urteilen und idealerweise auch im Handeln, als gutes, überlegtes und gewolltes Urteilen und Handeln, und solche Urteile und solche Handlungen nennen wir auch „reif". Der reife Mensch erfüllt seine Rolle in der Gesellschaft, was heißt dass er als guter Staatsbürger, als gutes Mitglied der Gesellschaft zum Guten der Gemeinschaft und dadurch aller Mitglieder der Gesellschaft beiträgt.

In der Alltagssprache wird „Unreife" mit Introvertiertheit, Selbstsucht und starker und sehr wechselhafter Emotionalität in Verbindung gebracht. „Introvertiertheit" bedeutet eine ungemäße Selbstreflexion, wodurch die Reflexion über die Außenwelt vernachlässigt wird; die Person beschäftigt sich in ihren Gedanken ungleich stark mit ihrem eigenen inneren Leben. „Selbstsucht" bedeutet dass das Handeln eines Menschen von der Absicht, das Gute für einen selber sicherzustellen, bestimmt wird, im Bewusstsein davon dass dies zum Nachteil anderer werden kann. Eine starke und sehr wechselhafte Emotionalität zeigt sich in Wutausbrüchen, exaltierter Freude, oder plötzlichen und gewaltigen Stimmungsveränderungen. Zusammen implizieren Introvertiertheit, Selbstsucht und starker und wechselhafter Emotionalität eine Geisteshaltung von Sorge um sich selber, d.h. ein Interesse an sich selber mit dem ausschließlichen Ziel sich selber zu befördern. Dies nennen wir Selbstzentriertheit. Ein solcher Mensch erfüllt nicht seine Rolle in der Gesellschaft, weder als Familienmit-

glied, noch als Arbeitskollege, Freund oder Mitbürger, was erwartet wird von einem Erwachsenen.

„Reife“ und „Unreife” sind in der Alltagssprache ein Gegensatzpaar, und diese Beschreibung von Unreife deutet darauf hin dass „Reife“ Extrovertiertheit und das Fehlen an Selbstsucht, und damit Sorge um Andere impliziert, sowie Gelassenheit. Ein solcher Mensch hat gute Intentionen, d.h. Intentionen andere Menschen zu befördern um ihrer selbst willen, und er hat die Fähigkeit gut zu urteilen. Dies, der Gegensatz von Selbstzentriertheit, entspricht einer gewissen Verwendung des Ausdrucks Sympathie in der Alltagssprache, als Sorge um Andere und als freundschaftliche Gefühle von Freude am Umgang mit den Mitmenschen.

Diese Art von Sympathie ist eine Voraussetzung dafür dass der Person das Leben Anderer und was ihr Leben wertvoll macht wichtig sind, und dadurch dafür dass der Person die moralische Handlungssituation wichtig wird. Eine Sympathie dieser Art richtet die Aufmerksamkeit der Person auf Andere und macht die Person empfänglich für moralisch relevante Information über die aktuelle Handlungssituation, was auf mögliche Handlungsalternative zeigt. Diese Art von Sympathie impliziert eine gewisse Bedeutung des Alltagsausdrucks der Autonomie, nämlich eine moralisch relevante Autonomie, eine die es einem ermöglicht nach der Moral zu leben, d.h. gut zu urteilen und gut zu handeln.

Die Hauptthese der Arbeit ist dass die Reife als eine durch die Sympathie geformte Autonomie beschrieben werden kann, was eine moralische Kompetenz, im Urteilen sowie im Handeln, ermöglicht. In der Alltagssprache bedeutet „Moral“ verschiedene Auffassungen wie man zu leben hat um andere Individuen zu unterstützen, im direkten, persönlichen Umgang sowie indirekt, durch Tätigkeiten zur Unterstützung der Gesellschaft als ganzes zugunsten aller ihrer Mitglieder. Die Reife, bezogen auf die Moral, ist eine Qualität die die Kompetenz erbringt moralisch zu leben. Sympathie in einer gewissen Bedeutung des Ausdrucks, nämlich als eine kontinuierliche, universale Sympathie, ist Interesse an den Anderen um seinetwillen, sowohl als freundschaftliche Gefühle. Dies motiviert zu und ermöglicht ein Leben nach der Moral. Autonomie ist Autorität, d.h. Dominanz, über einen selber, wo das Selbst aus Körper und Bewusstsein mit allen ihren Funktionen besteht. Die Autonomie ermöglicht es, das eigene Leben nach eigenem Willen sozial zu gestalten. Die universale Art

der Sympathie ermöglicht eine moralisch relevante Erkenntnis und motiviert dazu, die Autorität über einen selber im Dienst der Moral zu stellen. Eine Autonomie die von einer universalen Sympathie ermöglicht sowohl als eingeschränkt, d.h. geformt wird, erbringt die moralische Kompetenz die das Kennzeichen der Reife ist. Diese moralische Kompetenz ist die Fähigkeit, reif zu urteilen und reif zu handeln. Diese Urteile sagen entweder dass etwas gut oder schlecht, richtig oder falsch ist, dass jemand gewisse Rechte besitzt oder nicht besitzt, oder dass etwas getan oder nicht getan werden soll. Dadurch dass sie von der Person selber stammen und das Ergebnis kritischer Reflexion und eigener Wahl sind, auf genügend moralisch relevantes Wissen basieren, klar formuliert sind und von der Person selber erklärt werden können, den guten Absichten der Person entsprechen, was bedeutet dass ihr Zweck die Unterstützung anderer Menschen ist, alle Menschen in betracht ziehen, nur das vorschreiben was die Moral verlangt, und dazu revidierbar sind im Angesicht neuer moralisch relevanter Informationen, besitzen sie eine gewisse Objektivität. Dies sichert eine Zuverlässigkeit im moralischen Urteil, wodurch der reife Mensch als moralischer Ratgeber Anderer funktionieren kann.

Ein Handeln nach diesen reifen Urteilen, ein reifes Handeln, ist ein Handeln das die Ziele der Moral verwirklicht, nämlich das Gute aller jetzigen und künftigen Mitglieder der Gesellschaft. Dies besteht, nach dem Alltagsausdruck des Guten, im Leben selber und in der Möglichkeit einer persönlichen Selbstverwirklichung, d.h. im Erhalten dessen was einem das Leben wertvoll macht.

Die individuelle Interpretation was anderen Menschen unterstützt ist von den jeweiligen gesellschaftlichen Sitten abhängig. Alle Menschen haben auch eine individuelle Persönlichkeit und eine eigene Lebensgeschichte mit individuellen Erfahrungen, was ihr Urteil beeinflusst. Aus diesem Grund werden sich die moralischen Urteile verschiedener reifer Menschen unterscheiden. Nichtdestotrotz werden die Urteile reifer Menschen mit unterschiedlicher kultureller Hintergrund eine gewisse Ähnlichkeit aufweisen, weil es gewisse grundlegende menschliche Bedürfnisse gibt, und deshalb Interessen und Präferenzen die von den meisten Menschen geteilt werden, vor allem am Leben zu bleiben und sich mit Aktivitäten beschäftigen die einem das Leben wertvoll machen.

Lebenslauf

Angaben zur Person: Nils Hedstrand

Geburtsdatum: 24.11.1973

Staatsangehörigkeit: Schwedisch

Familienstand: Ledig

Schulbildung und Studium:

1980-1989	Grundschule in Schweden
1989-1992	Gymnasium in Schweden, Gesellschaftswissenschaftsprogramm
1992-1993	Studium der Geschichte an der Hochschule in Karlstad, Schweden
1994-1998	Studium der Philosophie, Ästhetik und Griechisch an der Uppsala Universität, Schweden
1997	Studium der Philosophie an der Uppsala Universität, Schweden
1999-2001	Studium der Philosophie an der Universität Wien, Österreich
2001	Magister der Philosophie an der Universität Wien, Österreich
2001-2006	Promotionsstudium der Philosophie an der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München
12.02.2007	Disputation zum Doktor der Philosophie an der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München