THE NATURES OF PRIDE AND SHAME

By

Jennifer Diane Kittlaus

Submitted to the graduate degree program in Philosophy and the Graduate Faculty of the University of Kansas in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

John J. Bricke, Chairperson
Professor Emeritus of Philosophy

Erin A. Frykholm
Assistant Professor of Philosophy

Corey J. Maley
Assistant Professor of Philosophy

Sarah K. Robins
Assistant Professor of Philosophy

Iris Smith Fischer
Professor of English

Date Defended: May 6, 2016

The Dissertation Committee for Jennifer Diane Kittlaus

certifies that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

THE NATURES OF PRIDE AND SHAME

John J. Bricke, Chairperson
Professor Emeritus of Philosophy

Date Approved: May 6, 2016

Abstract

      In this dissertation, I explore the natures of emotional pride and shame. Using elements from Hume's discussion of pride and humility in Book 2 of the *Treatise*, as well as Gabriele Taylor's analysis of pride and shame in *Pride, Shame, and Guilt: Emotions of Self-Assessment*, I argue against the view that pride and shame necessarily involve (global) self-evaluations. Put another way, I reject the view that pride and shame necessarily constitute one's judging that one has experienced some gain or loss in status, respectively. Instead, I contend that they are best understood as constituting one's being importantly satisfied or dissatisfied (respectively) with some (localized) aspect of an entity, whether oneself or an entity to which one stands in the (close) relation of 'belonging.' In addition, I emphasize that the evaluations involved in pride and shame are made in light of (or against the backdrop of) the emoter's beliefs, desires, values, etc. I do not dispute the fact that others' views may shape one's own. Rather, I claim that experiences of pride and shame importantly reflect that emoter's values, beliefs, desires, norms of expectations, etc. Finally, I stress that unless one is able to acknowledge that the entity in question (whether it be oneself or another) is capable of failing to meet one's expectations, one cannot experience pride or shame. Notably, in the case of pride, unless one believes it is possible for that entity to fail, one cannot truly feel satisfied that the entity in question met or exceeded one's standards.

Acknowledgments

I am incredibly grateful to so many for having supported me during this process. Jack Bricke, my adviser, has supported and encouraged me since the very beginning of my graduate career at the University of Kansas. It is due to my coursework and conversations with him about Hume's views on pride and humility that I became interested in examining the natures of pride and shame. I shall forever be grateful to Jack for all that he has taught me, for the many ways in which he has inspired me, and for everything that he has done to help me complete this dissertation.

I also would like to thank the other members of my dissertation committee—namely, Erin Frykholm, Corey Maley, Sarah Robins, and Iris Smith Fischer—for their support, advice, and feedback. The discussions I had with Corey Maley about shame were particularly helpful, and I hope to continue our discussions about shame and shaming.

For the important ways in which they contributed to my philosophical development during my years in graduate school at the University of Kansas, I would like to recognize faculty members Richard De George, Ben Eggleston, the late Tony Genova, Don Marquis, and Tom Tuozzo. I am grateful to Cindi Hodges, Cari Ann Kreienhop, and Morgan Swartzlander, who helped me navigate various procedural processes throughout the dissertation process. I would like to extend special thanks to Allison Faling, Linda Keeler, and Pam Botts for advocating for me, for providing me with emotional and moral support, and for facilitating my joining a dissertation group. I shall miss the weekly (and sometimes daily) check-ins with my dissertation group: writing a dissertation is a lonely endeavor, and I have greatly appreciated having fellow dissertators with whom to share ups and downs, commiserate, strategize, and brainstorm.

Contents

Chapter 4: Pride Revisited, and Some Further Remarks on Pride and on Shame

Introduction

This dissertation shall be on the natures of pride and of shame. I became interested in this topic while considering the extent to which our feeling proud of ourselves in some way or another might lead to the opening up in our minds of new courses of action, while feeling ashamed of ourselves might constrain us in ways that would lead to our believing ourselves incapable of performing particular actions or even believing certain possibilities were out of our reach. This led to my thinking about pride and shame more generally, and what I found was that there was little contemporary literature on these two emotions. So, I decided to undertake the project of analyzing the two myself.

In chapter 1, as a means to show the need for such a project, I shall discuss the state of the current contemporary literature on the emotions and show how the general trend of focusing on the emotions as a whole provides little insight into the specific natures of particular emotions. Then, I shall introduce what I recognize as being the only example of a contemporary work that seeks to provide an in-depth analysis of pride and shame—namely, Gabriele Taylor's *Pride, Shame, and Guilt: Emotions of Self-Assessment*. For the remainder of the chapter, I shall discuss the methods that she uses in that work.

In chapter 2, I shall begin analyzing pride. Given that Taylor's account is Humean in nature, and given that my own views on pride and shame are greatly influenced by Hume's work, I shall start off the chapter by providing a general account of Hume's views in the *Treatise*. In addition, I shall consider the ways in which Taylor amends Hume's account. Once I have a basic rendering of Taylor's views on pride in place, I shall indicate some of the ways in which I agree with her analysis; but I shall also indicate ways in which I disagree with her analysis. The main

point of contention that I shall raise concerns her view that we view pride as being an emotion of self-assessment. For on this view, pride amounts to seeing oneself as having been raised in status. This shall turn out to be a matter that comes up in subsequent chapters, as she holds the same for shame, too, seeing shame as involving the judgment that one's status has been degraded. Having established some general points of agreement and disagreement with Taylor's view on pride, I shall temporarily suspend my discussion of pride, picking it up again in chapter 4.

In chapter 3, I shall analyze shame. As I did in chapter 2, I shall begin by considering Hume's view of shame, as well as Taylor's. But then I will go on to construct a preliminary account of shame that conceives of shame as representing one's dissatisfaction with how some event, or set of circumstances, impinges on the view that one takes of oneself, or that one takes of someone in whose life she takes a special interest. The notions of vulnerability, helplessness, and dissatisfaction will be central themes.

In chapter 4, the final chapter of the dissertation, I shall return to my discussion of pride. But instead of considering pride in isolation, I shall make use of my discussion of shame in chapter 3 to bring out some of the similarities, as well as the differences, between the two. Then, I shall offer some further remarks about the two. Topics that I shall consider include the roles that pride and shame play in shaping our lives, what pride and shame tell us about ourselves, what is required in order to feel pride or shame, and the role that pride and shame play in action. At the end of the chapter, returning to the larger question of whether pride and shame are best understood as emotions of self-assessment, what I shall urge is that pride and shame are best understood as attitudes of satisfaction and dissatisfaction, respectively, toward aspects of ourselves or those about whom we care (or in whom we take a special kind of interest).

Chapter One: The Quest to Understand Pride and Shame

Introduction

This shall be a dissertation about the natures of, and the relationship between, pride and shame, once a much-discussed topic but at present a topic on which very few philosophers have written or are writing. While there are contemporary philosophers who have written on pride or on shame, respectively, rare is the contemporary philosopher who has written on the relationship between the two. For the most part, contemporary philosophers interested in the emotions have tended to focus on the emotions proper, and have pursued questions such as how we ought to categorize the emotions amongst our mental states, how best to express the content of the emotions, what (if any) relationship exists between rationality and the emotions, what (if any) role the emotions play in motivation as well as action explanation, and what (if any) connection exists between morality and the emotions. These are interesting and worthwhile lines of enquiry, and they have served to forward the project of better understanding some general aspects of pride and shame.

We shall focus on one such account of the emotions—namely, that of Robert Gordon, in *The Structure of Emotions: Investigations in Cognitive Philosophy*.[1] I have selected his account because I think that it provides a useful—and insightful—framework for thinking about the emotions in general, as well as about pride and shame in particular. Afterwards, I shall familiarize the reader with some of Gabriele Taylor's general remarks about pride and shame in her *Pride, Shame, and Guilt: Emotions of Self-Assessment*,[2] as I shall be using parts of her

---

[1] Robert M. Gordon, *The Structure of Emotions: Investigations in Cognitive Philosophy*, Cambridge Studies in Philosophy (1987; repr., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990).
[2] Gabriele Taylor, *Pride, Shame, and Guilt: Emotions of Self-Assessment* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985).

analysis in order to conduct my own. Both accounts examine emotional experience from the emoter's point of view, meaning that both consider what judgments play a causal role in prompting the emotional experience.

Gordon's Account of the Emotions

In *The Structure of Emotions*, Robert Gordon proposes a new classificatory system of emotions, in an effort to establish the logical constraints on emotional experiences. In place of the traditional classificatory model, which distinguishes between backward-looking emotions (*i.e.*, emotions that are "directed toward things, persons, or states of affairs that exist presently or have existed in the past") and forward-looking emotions (*i.e.*, emotions that are "directed toward future possibilities"), Gordon offers a model that is based on the formal conditions for making linguistic attributions for particular emotions. Gordon focuses on the words that we use to name various emotions, as well as the linguistic expressions that we use in conjunction with those emotion-words to describe emotional experiences. What he discovers is that almost without exception, we can describe a person's emotional experience as *S's emoting that p*.[3]

Besides observing that emotions are intentional states, or states about something, Gordon determines that particular emotions seem to belong to one or the other of two main categories: (1) factive or (2) epistemic. Factive emotions, which Gordon claims include pride and shame, presuppose that the emoter knows whether or not *p* (the state of affairs in question) has occurred or is occurring. On the other hand, epistemic emotions presuppose that the emoter is uncertain as to whether or not *p* has occurred, is occurring, or shall occur.

---

[3] Gordon, *The Structure of Emotions*, x. Two emotion-words that he suggests fail to fit this model are 'love' and 'hate.'

Gordon thinks drawing this kind of distinction between emotions—*i.e.*, one that is based

on whether or not an emoter knows, or is certain, of the state of affairs in question—is preferable

to the traditional forward- and backward-looking distinction insofar as it better captures the

causal conditions for one's emotional experience. He claims that what underlies the distinction

between backward- and forward-looking emotions are linguistic "tense preferences."[4] Since

emotional experiences are intentional states—*i.e.*, states *about* something—we can attribute them

to others, using the linguistic form of "*S* emotes that *p*," where we insert for 'emotes' the verb-

form of the emotion that some person, '*S*,' is experiencing; and for '*p*,' a proposition that

describes the state of affairs at which the emotion is directed. So, from the fact that substitutions

for '*p*' often contain a verb that is in present or past tense, philosophers have concluded that most

emotions are backward-looking emotions in nature.

Taking a closer look at hope and fear, and the verb tenses of the propositions substituted

for '*p*,' Gordon argues that neither is always directed toward an event that has not yet occurred.

He observes, "[w]e can readily imagine someone hoping or being afraid that a certain train

arrived late."[5] So, even though we might usually associate hope and fear with states of affairs

that have not yet occurred (and may not even occur), it is the case that one can experience them

in response to states of affairs that have occurred. Branching out, he considers being glad and

being happy, two states that we usually associate with states of affairs that have already

occurred. Once again, he observes that the original classification made is faulty, as "we can

imagine someone being glad or unhappy that the train will arrive late (future tense)."[6] Gordon

concludes that "using tense as our criterion…no emotion would be exclusively forward-looking

---

[4] Robert M. Gordon, "Emotions and Knowledge," *Journal of Philosophy* 66, no. 13 (July 3, 1969): 409.
[5] Gordon, *The Structure of Emotions*, 25.
[6] *Ibid*.

and no emotion would be exclusively backward-looking."[7]

Thus, he suggests that we focus not on whether or not the state of affairs in question has occurred, but on whether or not the emoter is certain about that which has prompted her emotion. He arrives at this by noticing that something seemed to be true about being glad that *p* or unhappy that *p*, on the one hand, and hoping that *p* and fearing that *p*, such that that one could never both be glad that *p* <u>and</u> hope that *p*, or be glad that *p* <u>and</u> fear that *p*, or be unhappy that *p* <u>and</u> hope that *p*, or be unhappy that *p* <u>and</u> fear that *p*. He decides that the reason why one cannot experience such pairings is that being glad or unhappy that *p* necessitates that the emoter is certain that *p*; but to hope that *p* or to fear that *p* necessitates that the emoter is uncertain that *p*.

On the basis of this difference, Gordon proposes that we call 'factive' those emotions that concern states of affairs of which the emoter is certain and 'epistemic' those emotions that concern states of affairs of which the emoter is uncertain. Using this new distinction, we can see that regardless of whether one's hope is aimed (a) at an event that has occurred or (b) at one that may or may not occur in the future, it is always the case that the emoter is uncertain about that event's having occurred or occurring in the future. Take the person who hopes that a particular train will arrive late or has arrived late. Necessarily, she is uncertain as to whether or not the train has arrived late or will arrive late. If she were certain that it had, or if she were certain that it would (because, say, she learned that the train departed three hours late and that under no possible circumstances could it make up that time), then she would no longer have any basis for hope, with respect to when the train did or would arrive. The same is true for being afraid. One can be afraid only in instances in which one is uncertain as to whether the state of affairs that has prompted her fear has occurred or will occur. Thus, hope and fear are epistemic emotions, which

---

[7] Gordon, *The Structure of Emotions*, 25.

also include worry, fright (being frightened), and terror (being terrified).[8]

Being glad and being unhappy, on the other hand, are factive emotions, since if one is glad or unhappy about some state of affairs, then she must be certain about whether or not that state of affairs has occurred or will occur. Amongst the factive emotions, Gordon includes pride, shame, embarrassment, disgust, excitement, and regret.[9]

Another important observation that Gordon makes concerns the difference between positive and negative emotions. Traditionally, we label an emotion positive or negative on the basis of whether the emotional response to the state of affairs in question, p, is positive or negative. But in order to account for the person's having a favorable or unfavorable response, Gordon notes, we must attribute to the emoter some sort of desire, want, or wish concerning p or not-p. For reasons that are beyond the scope of our discussion, Gordon settles on wishing as the appropriate state,[10] and differentiates between (a) those emotions that involve an emoter's wishing *that p* and (b) those emotions that involve an emoter's wishing *that* not-p. Put more succinctly, he differentiates between emotions that involve wish-satisfaction and those that involve wish-frustration. With respect to pride and shame, on Gordon's analysis, pride is a factive emotion that involves wish-satisfaction, while shame is a factive emotion that involves wish-frustration.

Thinking about the extent to which, if any, the epistemic/factive distinction provides insight into the natures of pride and shame, I think that Gordon is right to focus his attention on the emoter and her propositional attitudes. Emotions are not states that inexplicably happen to us; rather, emotions are states that arise, at least in part, due to what we believe, what we desire,

---

[8] Gordon, *The Structure of Emotions*, 27.
[9] *Ibid.*
[10] *Ibid.*, 30−31.

what we prefer, and what we value. But Gordon takes this one step further, claiming that, in the case of the factive emotions, '*S* emotes that *p*' only if '*S* knows that *p*'; and for the epistemic emotions, '*S emotes* that *p*' only if '*S* does not know that *p*.' He illustrates: "if a person is glad or happy that *p* then he *knows* that *p*, whereas a person hopes or fears that *p* only if he *does not know* that *p*."[11] I am not convinced that including a knowledge criterion is necessary. My reluctance pertains to its consequences for emotion attribution—namely, that it makes attributing an emotional experience turn on whether or not an emoter's beliefs about the state of affairs in question rise to the level of certainty. Consider a mother who feels proud of her daughter for having won an Olympic goal medal. According to Gordon, whether or not that mother feels pride depends on *her* knowing that her daughter won an Olympic gold medal. So, should the mother falsely believe that her daughter won an Olympic gold medal, then this mother's emotion could not be pride. But this does not seem correct. What strikes me as being necessary for the mother's feeling proud of her daughter seems to be the mother's *believing* that her daughter won an Olympic gold medal. Whether the mother's belief rises to the level of knowledge seems not to bear on whether *she* feels proud of her daughter, but whether *her pride* is reasonable.

In other words, I contend there is an important difference between (a) identifying the causal components and the constituents of emotional experiences and (b) evaluating the reasonableness of the emotions; and I do not think that every case in which we can find a problem in the emoter's grounds for her emotional experience should result in our declassifying or failing to be able to classify the emotional experience as a particular instance of some type of emotion. In other words, I do not think that a false belief, on its own, justifies our reclassifying

---

[11] Gordon, *The Structure of Emotions*, 26.

the mother's pride as an experience of some unnamed, but similar, emotion.[12]

Consider someone who neither knows, nor has any relationship that could be construed as being significant to, an Olympic gold medal winner. Her circumstances seem to rule our her being able to be proud of the Olympic gold medal winner, and we should meet with skepticism any claim of hers to the contrary. Or consider someone who, upon watching the race for which our individual won the gold medal, begins to stomp around the room and curse the Olympic gold medal winner. Her behavior would seem to rule out her being able to be proud of the Olympic gold medal winner, and we should meet with skepticism any claim of hers to the contrary.

What I am denying is that cases like the afore-proposed case of the mother's being proud of her daughter for winning the Olympic gold medal should be judged as a case of the mother's experiencing not pride, but some unnamed, but similar, emotion, solely because her belief that her daughter won an Olympic gold medal is false. In the course of defending the knowledge requirement for the factive emotions, Gordon asserts that, at least at the time he was writing (his book was published in 1987), most contemporary philosophical causal analyses and reliability analyses of propositional knowledge agreed that "*if* S *knows that* p *then* S *would not have believed that* p *if it were not the case that* p."[13] His point in introducing this principle is to suggest that it is the knowledge condition that provides the foundation for our recognizing patterns between states of affairs and people's behavioral responses to them—*i.e.*, the behavioral responses that are associated with, or are expressions of, emotional responses to the world. In other words, he seems to be claiming that were we not to include this knowledge requirement,

---

[12] It would appear that this is how Davidson, who proposes a propositional account of pride that requires that the emoter's corresponding beliefs be true, would handle such cases. For he refers to "pride founded on a true belief and an otherwise similar passion founded on a false belief" on p. 279 of his "Hume's Cognitive Theory of Pride," in *Essays on Actions and Events*, 2nd ed., 277−90 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).

[13] Gordon, *The Structure of Emotions*, 60. Italics are his.

we would, in essence, commit ourselves to the position that to understand a person's emotional

response merely amounts to understanding something about that particular individual. The

problem, Gordon believes, is that a knowledge requirement is required in order to establish some

kind of causal connection between the world and the individual. For Gordon views the

knowledge requirement as providing the "causal connections that link a person's demeanor to the

world." He urges:

> Common sense says that when you are angry or delighted about, for instance, Dewey's
> having been elected, Dewey's having been elected *affects* you in some way; namely, *it*
> *makes you angry*, or it *delights you*. You are angry *because* Dewey was elected. If you
> *regret* that Dewey was elected, then Dewey's having been elected is the "cause" or
> "source" of your regret.[14]

I am sympathetic with Gordon's views to the extent that I think that it is likely that many,

if not most, actual experiences of factive emotions turn out to be cases in which his knowledge

criterion is met. Furthermore, it strikes me that our ability to make generalizations about the

emotions depends upon there being some degree of consistency between what is the case and

what the emoter believes to be the case. But, for our purposes, I shall set aside questions

concerning assessing the reasonableness of one's experiencing a particular emotion.

As for Gordon's wish requirement—*i.e.*, his claim that a positive emotion like pride

involves a wish that *p* be the case, and a negative emotion like shame involves a wish that it not

be the case that *p*—I think that it provides a very helpful insight. The wish requirement

contributes to Gordon's overall analysis of the factive emotions insofar as he envisions the

factive emotions as consisting of effects of wish-satisfaction/wish-frustration (his examples

include being displeased, upset, sad, and glad) and effects of a particular type of wish-

---

[14] Gordon, *The Structure of Emotions*, 61.

satisfaction/wish-frustration (his examples include being angry, indignant, embarrassed, ashamed, pleased, proud, afraid, and hopeful).[15] Rightly, he notes the wish involved need not have been held antecedently, but that it could develop at the time at which the individual becomes certain, or knows, that some particular state of affairs has occurred.

Another helpful insight that Gordon provides is that the factive emotions (like pride and shame), insofar as they represent effects of particular *types* of wish-satisfaction/wish-frustration, have more specialized causal structures than the epistemic emotions. He does not view the need for deeper analysis as a roadblock to our understanding these emotion-designating words' formal structures. On the contrary, he suggests that one could program a computer to elicit the beliefs, wishes, and, in certain instances, other pro/con propositional attitudes involved in any of the factive emotions. He even provides an example of how one might program a computer to elicit the various elements involved in anger, offering the following script:

What are you angry about?

My lawn.

What is it about your lawn that makes you angry?

Hardly anything has grown on it.

So you're angry about the fact that hardly anything has grown on your lawn. Who's to blame?

The fellow who sold me that new type of weed killer.

You're angry at the fellow who sold you that new type of weed killer?[16]

I appreciate Gordon's recognizing the need for a more robust framework to use in order

---

[15] Gordon, *The Structure of Emotions*, 53, 63, 64, and 111.
[16] *Ibid.*, 57.

to analyze this set of emotions and his offering a sketch of how one might expand a computer model to accommodate one particular specialized structure. But at the same time, I find it frustrating that he does not provide insight into the process he used in order to produce this framework. Moreover, I find it frustrating that he does not go on to suggest ways in which he believes their frameworks might be similar to or differ from that he proposed for anger. At least on the face of it, his proposed model for 'anger' is not transferable to 'pride' or 'shame'; and without any of the kinds of discussion I described, it is not clear how we might go about evaluating his claim to have provided a model for the factive emotions that would enable us to "obtain a complete set of truth conditions for sentences of the form 'S [emotes] about the fact that p.'"[17]

A broader worry I have about Gordon's analysis of the factive emotions is that the propositional form that he uses does not explicitly make reference to the object, or target, of one's pride or shame—namely, the person or persons of whom one is proud or ashamed. And it would seem that it should, given that one is not merely proud or ashamed that some event or state of affairs has occurred. Rather, one is proud or ashamed of herself, another, or even a group of individuals, for something that she, the other, or some group of individuals has done (including acts of omission). Of course, we can rewrite a proposition like 'Millie is proud of herself for having stood up to the lunchroom bully' to fit the form 'S emotes that p.' In this case, the resulting proposition would be 'Millie is proud that she stood up to the lunchroom bully.' However doing so comes at an important cost: for if what we are trying to do is get clear on the formal, or structural, elements of these emotions, then in addition to making reference to the event or state of affairs that serves as a causal contributor to Millie's being proud, we must also

---

[17] Gordon, *The Structure of Emotions*, 57.

make reference to the target of her pride. Otherwise, we run the risk of losing sight of the fact that pride and shame, unlike, say, joy or unhappiness, are person-implicating emotions.

All of this said, I think that Gordon provides us with a helpful starting point. What we learn from him is that in order to understand emotions like pride and shame, we must consider not only what an emoter believes to be the case (or believes has occurred), but also what that emoter wishes to be, or have been, the case. Of course, we shall have to say more about the kind of wishes that are involved, but, as we shall ultimately see, Gordon steers us in the right direction when he suggests that emotions like pride and shame are types of wish-satisfaction and wish-frustration, respectively.

At this point, we shall shift our attention away from Gordon, whose interest is in exploring the emotions in general, and shift our attention to Taylor, who proposes a framework specifically for analyzing pride and shame.

Taylor's Framework for Understanding Pride and Shame

Gabriele Taylor's chief aim in *Pride, Shame, and Guilt: Emotions of Self-Assessment* is to render rationally intelligible the three emotions in question. However, in the course of analyzing pride, shame, and guilt, Taylor also explores other emotions of self-assessment such as humiliation, embarrassment, and remorse. Taylor explains that what makes each of these emotions an emotion of self-assessment is that a person who experiences any of these emotions "will believe of herself that she has deviated from some norm and that in doing so she has altered her standing in the world."[18] In other words, according to Taylor, what sets these emotions apart from other emotions is the presence of self-directed, self-evaluative beliefs on the part of the

---

[18] Taylor, 1.

emoter.

Given that the criteria for being an emotion of self-assessment are these self-directed, self-evaluative beliefs, Taylor limits her analysis of the emotions of self-assessment to the beliefs that are involved in these emotions. Importantly, Taylor acknowledges that in doing so, her account of these emotions will not be complete, indicating that "[a] complete account would normally include consideration of other features, such as wants and wishes, sensations and physiological changes."[19] She is also careful to point out that her choice to analyze these particular emotions in terms of their beliefs should not be taken to imply that she believes that every analysis of emotions should be conducted in terms of beliefs. In other words, it is only for the reason that she believes that beliefs are importantly connected to the experience of the particular emotions in question—emotions of self-assessment—that she has elected to proceed in this way.

At the same time, it is clear that Taylor thinks that beliefs are constitutive of every emotion. Observing that emotional experiences, in general, are experiences that necessarily affect the emoter in some way, she claims that one can ascertain whether some situation or state of affairs has affected a person by determining whether or not that person has a favorable or unfavorable attitude toward that particular situation or state of affairs. And, according to Taylor, these favorable or unfavorable attitudes "will be reflected in [one's] beliefs."[20] While she does not employ formal language when talking about these relations, I take it that her claim is that in order for any person, *X*, in some situation, *Y*, to be experiencing an emotional state, *Z*, it is necessary for *X* to possess a belief that expresses either a favorable or an unfavorable attitude

---

[19] Taylor, 2.
[20] *Ibid.*, 5.

toward *Y*. If this is an accurate representation of her claim, it would follow that *X*'s failing to possess a belief that expresses either a favorable or an unfavorable attitude toward *Y* would rule out *X*'s experiencing any kind of emotional state, *Z*, toward *Y*.

As noted above, Taylor's goal is to make pride and shame rationally intelligible. She hopes to do so by identifying for each of them two types, or sets, of beliefs: (1) identificatory beliefs and (2) explanatory beliefs. The first set of beliefs, *identificatory* beliefs, consists of those beliefs that individuate each emotion of self-assessment. As the beliefs that distinguish particular emotions of self-assessment from one another, identificatory beliefs provide the standards for classifying an emoter's experience as one particular kind of emotion of self-assessment. So, should Taylor succeed in articulating the beliefs that identify, or constitute, one's emotional experiences as a particular emotion of self-assessment, she will have theoretically provided us with a standard that will enable us to identify which, if any, emotion of self-assessment one is experiencing. This would be especially useful for differentiating between and amongst the negative emotions of self-assessment of shame and guilt, as well as humiliation and embarrassment, since, at least on the face of it, specific states of affairs seem to be able to elicit both shame and guilt, or humiliation and embarrassment.

The second set, explanatory beliefs, consists of those beliefs that causally explain the emoter's being in some particular emotional state. Put another way, an emoter's explanatory beliefs cite her reasons for her being in some particular emotional state. Theoretically, should Taylor succeed in articulating the beliefs that causally explain, and provide the emoter's reasons for having, some particular set of identificatory belief(s), she will have provided us with the means to assess the extent to which an emoter's grounds for being in a particular emotional state

15

are reasonable.[21]

To further explain and to demonstrate the roles that identificatory beliefs and explanatory beliefs play, Taylor offers some examples that involve what she takes to be "exceedingly simple" experiences of (the non-self-evaluative emotion of) fear.[22] Since identificatory beliefs are constitutive of emotions insofar as they individuate emotional states from one another, Taylor proposes that the identificatory belief for fear would usually be the belief that the situation or state of affairs in which the emoter finds herself is dangerous or presents some sort of harm.[23] To be clear, she is not claiming that every emotional experience involves *the emoter's* possessing the identificatory belief in question. Rather, her claim is that every emotion is itself made separate and distinct from all others on the basis of certain beliefs. To demonstrate this point, she has us imagine a visitor at the herpetology exhibit at a zoo, looking in fear at a venomous snake that is securely housed behind glass. In one scenario, the fearful visitor believes that the snake poses her harm in view of believing, albeit falsely, that the venomous snake could easily escape its enclosure and inject her with its potentially deadly venom. Since this visitor believes that the snake poses a threat to her, she possesses the identificatory belief that is associated with, or is constitutive of, fear. In a second scenario, the fearful visitor does not hold the belief that the venomous snake that she is viewing poses her any harm. Instead, she believes that her fear was triggered by a memory of a traumatic childhood experience with snakes.[24]

Taylor regards the emoter in both scenarios to be experiencing fear, despite the fact that only the former emoter believes that the situation in which she finds herself is dangerous. In a

---

[21] I take it that all that Taylor means by this is that we will have a means for determining whether the person's emotional state depends on, for instance, a false belief. I do not take her to be making the claim that emotions are outcomes of a deliberative process.

[22] Taylor, 4.

[23] *Ibid.*, 2.

[24] *Ibid.*, 2–3; 3n3.

footnote,[25] Taylor indicates that this is not a universally accepted view, pointing to Roger

Scruton's discussion of fear in his "Attitudes, Beliefs, and Reasons."[26] She attributes to Scruton

the view that every instance of fear includes a belief that some particular thing is harmful and

that he, on the basis of it, concludes, in her words, that "as a matter of logic, we cannot talk of

fear except when there is this belief." Taylor counters by pointing to our everyday practice of

considering as genuine instances of fear at least some cases in which the emoter fails to have

such a belief. She believes it would be arbitrary to reject our describing such cases as cases of

fear solely on the basis of the emoter's not possessing this particular belief. At the same time, she

acknowledges that when our evidence that a person is feeling fear consists of our observations of

that person's reactions to a situation, then the standard of what counts as evidence that a person

is feeling fear is defined by the reactions that typically accompany the instances of feeling fear

that are attended by the belief that the situation in question is harmful.

Taylor's second scenario of the snake example supports her remarks—i.e., the scenario in

which the emoter does not possess the identificatory belief associated with fear. There does not

seem to be good reason to discount the emoter's claim that she experienced fear upon seeing the

snake just because she acknowledges that she does not believe that the snake poses her any harm.

Assuming that she is accurately reporting how she felt or behaved upon seeing the snake, and

assuming that what she reports resembles what we take to be consistent with fear-prompted

feelings or behavior, we would have reasonable grounds for believing that what she is feeling is

fear.

In sum, on Taylor's view, the intelligibility of fear depends on the emoter's either (1)

---

[25] Taylor, 3n3.
[26] Roger Scruton, "Attitudes, Beliefs, and Reasons" in *Morality and Moral Reasoning*, ed. John Casey (London: Methuen, 1971).

possessing the identificatory belief associated with fear or (2) acting in ways or describing having feelings that are considered typical of those associated with or prompted by fear. Using this standard, each emoter in the proposed scenarios is intelligibly experiencing fear. A scenario that would count as a case of unintelligible fear would be one in which a joyful emoter claims to be experiencing fear, despite (a) denying that she believes that the snake is harmful, (b) eagerly standing for long periods of time in close proximity to the snake, and (c) expressing a deep desire to hold the snake in question. Because the evidence in this scenario is inconsistent with—and even contraindicative of—fear, the reasonable judgment would be that whatever the person is feeling, it is not fear.

While differentiating between cases of intelligible fear and unintelligible fear is one of the reasons that Taylor offers her examples of fear, her main objective in offering these two scenarios is to demonstrate the difference between explanations of fear that seek to make the emoter's being in an emotional state of fear rationally intelligible and those that do not. Amongst the beliefs held by the emoter in the first scenario is a belief that explains the fear that the emoter experiences. The emoter fears the snake (i.e., the emoter believes that the venomous snake poses a threat to her) because she believes that it can easily escape its enclosure and inject her with its potentially deadly venom. The fact that the venomous snake is not able to easily escape its enclosure and inject her with its potentially deadly venom does not impact the role that the emoter's explanatory belief seeks to play—for this belief of hers does <u>seek</u> to justify why she the emoter fears the snake. All we are concerned about at this moment is whether the emoter has, in her set of beliefs, any belief that aims to make intelligible why the emoter believes the snake poses her harm.

As for the emoter in the second scenario, her failing to possess any reason to fear the

snake renders her fear rationally unintelligible. What she posits as the cause of the experience that she associates as fear is the memory of a traumatic experience with a snake. Such a memory, even if it were to turn out to be the cause of her fear, could never serve as a reason to fear the snake. Unless the emoter believes that there is something about the snake that makes it dangerous, the emoter fails to have a reason to fear the snake. To be clear, the absence of such a belief, on its own, does not discount the emoter's claim that the emotional state that she is in is fear. As I indicated above, as long as the emoter demonstrates behavior or describes feelings that are consistent with those prompted by fear, Taylor contends that we have reason to consider her experience to be one of intelligible fear. The difference, however, between this emoter's fear and the emoter's fear in the first scenario is that this emoter does not actually fear the snake. She may display fearful behavior and experience what we associate as fearful feelings; yet, were one to ask her whether she believes the snake poses a threat to her—i.e., whether she believes the snake is something to fear—she would reply in the negative. Thus, her introduction of the traumatic childhood experience does not aim to make her fear rationally intelligible—it seeks merely to account for why she is experiencing the feelings associated with fear or behaving in ways associated with fear, despite the fact that she has no belief to the effect that the snake provides a danger to her. As Taylor explains, "[her] fear does not seem to have a reason, and the reference to [her] childhood experience is an attempt to explain [her] irrational fear."[27]

At this point, we have distinguished between cases of fear that are intelligible and unintelligible, as well as between cases in which one's causal explanations of one's fear seek to render one's fear rationally intelligible and cases in which they do not. Finally, we shall distinguish between cases in which one's causal explanation of one's fear succeeds in making it

---

[27] Taylor, 2.

rationally intelligible and cases in which they do not. Clearly, since the fear experienced by the emoter in scenario one is based on a false (explanatory) belief, her fear is irrational. Yet Taylor makes clear that possessing all true beliefs, while necessary, is not sufficient for rendering one's fear rational.

Besides its being necessary that the emoter's explanatory beliefs are all true, two additional requirements are that the emoter's beliefs must be justified and must take into account all of the relevant information. So, should our scenario have been modified, and it *had* been the case the venomous snake had not been safely secured in its enclosure (and, as a result, could easily escape and inject its potentially poisonous venom in the visitor in question), that alone would not make her fear rational. In addition to being true, that belief would also have to be justified; furthermore, the emoter's beliefs would have to have taken into consideration all of the evidence that was readily available to her.[28] What Taylor has in mind here is a case in which an emoter, despite possessing true and justified explanatory beliefs, has overlooked additional information that, were she to have considered it, would have shown her that her initial reasons for fearing the snake are, in fact, unreasonable.[29] Returning to the above-proposed modified venomous snake example, Taylor has us imagine that the snake in question, despite being venomous and in a position to easily escape from its enclosure, is so timid in nature that it is highly unlikely that the venomous snake would leave its enclosure, let alone bite someone. The emoter's fear in such a case would clearly be unreasonable, should the visitor have been aware of this information but not considered it in her assessment of the situation. But even if she had not been aware of this information, we still might consider her fear unreasonable, should this

---

[28] Taylor, 3−4.
[29] *Ibid*., 4.

additional information have been readily available or easily accessible.[30]

Unlike in the above case, in which Taylor provides a set of identificatory and explanatory beliefs that make rationally intelligible one particular example of fear, Taylor ultimately constructs for pride, shame, and guilt, respectively, a general set of identificatory and explanatory beliefs that she claims renders rationally intelligible all cases of each respective emotion.[31] In addition, she discusses for each the criteria for deciding whether an emoter's experience of each is unintelligible, rational, irrational,[32] and, in the case of shame, false.

With her objectives and proposed framework in place, Taylor discusses one more topic concerning the relationship between emotions and beliefs before launching into her exploration of the emotions of self-assessment—namely, the conditions under which a person's belief counts as a reason that makes her holding another belief rationally intelligible. The manner in which she sets out her account of these conditions is via critical analysis of Donald Davidson's proposed account of the rational intelligibility of pride in his "Hume's Cognitive Theory of Pride,"[33] an essay in which Davidson argues for a Humean account of propositional pride.

At the outset, one should note that some similarities exist between Taylor and Davidson.

---

[30] Taylor acknowledges that identifying the identificatory or explanatory beliefs will not always be a straightforward endeavor; moreover, she admits that there may be cases in which we may not be able to easily disentangle the identificatory and explanatory beliefs. In short, Taylor does not assume that every case will easily break down into explanatory beliefs that obviously justify or obviously fail to justify the identificatory belief in question. In short, she recognizes that a further complication might arise—namely, that of deciding what sort of explanatory beliefs would count as being sufficient to justify the particular identificatory belief. See Taylor, 4−5.

[31] Taylor does not comment on whether there exist experiences of the emotions of self-assessment in which the emoter does not possess a corresponding identificatory belief. Presumably there are. But this fact would not undermine her project, since her stated aim is to make three emotions of self-assessment rationally intelligible, and one can make rationally intelligible only those experiences in which the emoter possesses an identificatory belief that itself can be explained in virtue of the emoter's beliefs.

[32] In some cases, Taylor uses 'unreasonable' instead of 'irrational'; at first glance, it struck me that she uses these labels to describe any instance in which an emoter holds an identificatory belief that she would not, were she to think more carefully about the circumstances surrounding the situation or reflect more deeply about her beliefs or values.

[33] Donald Davidson, "Hume's Cognitive Theory of Pride," in *Essays on Actions and Events*, 2nd ed., 277−90 (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).

For one, both find inspiration for their analyses of pride in Hume's views on the indirect

passions, which include, amongst others, pride, humility, love, and hatred, as given in Book 2

("Of the Passions") of his *A Treatise of Human Nature*.[34] Furthermore, each seems to view

her/himself as providing an account of what Hume *should* have said, were he to have abandoned

some of his problematic philosophical commitments (like those to atomism and associationism)

and further developed certain existing features of his account. Taylor explains,

> I do not intend to discuss in detail Hume's analysis of pride as one of the indirect
> passions; his views on the distinction between 'cause' and 'object' of a passion and the
> mechanism of association have received a fair amount of attention. I shall concentrate
> rather on only those points which bear directly on his explanation of the nature of pride.
> Here his major points are, I think, essentially correct. In particular, his distinction
> between the cause and the object of pride indicates the fundamental structure of the
> emotion. But what he wants to say can be put in less misleading terminology. Restating
> his insights in terms of explanatory and identificatory beliefs will reveal more clearly
> what pride consists in, and will also sort out the ambiguities in some of Hume's
> assertions.

> Davidson expresses a similar kind of confidence with respect to disentangling Hume's

insights into the causal components of pride from those aspects of his account that are extraneous

or problematic, updating Hume's conceptual framework, and presenting an account whose roots

trace back to Hume himself:

> It is evident that there are serious inadequacies in Hume's theory, so it is understandable
> that most recent writers who have discussed Hume have focused on the flaws. They have
> gone wrong, in my view, in rejecting the causal aspect of Hume's doctrine as if it were
> inseparable from the atomistic psychology. But what is far more lamentable is that
> Hume's genuine insights have been almost totally ignored. For if I am right these insights
> [Hume's causal analysis], when freed from Hume's epistemological machinery, can be
> restated and assembled into an intriguing and persuasive theory. In what follows I urge
> the merits of this theory and show how it can be extracted from the *Treatise*. I do not
> pretend that this is what Hume really meant; it is what he *should* have meant, and did

---

[34] David Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature*, ed. David Fate Norton and Mary J. Norton, *A Treatise of Human Nature: A Critical Edition*, vol. 1, *Texts*, paperback edition (2007; paperback edition, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 2.1.1.4. Hereafter, I will cite the work as the *Treatise*.

inspire.[35]

For our present purposes of understanding what it is about Davidson's account of rational intelligibility that Taylor rejects, and why, as well as understanding what Taylor proposes in its place, we need not—and so shall not—examine the extent to which their respective accounts of the structure and contents of the propositions that make pride rationally intelligible are 'Humean.'[36] I mention this shared starting point of Taylor's and Davidson's simply to provide some context to the discussion.

Taylor limits her critical analysis of Davidson's account of propositional pride to the logical form that one of Davidson's proposed explanatory beliefs takes. According to Taylor, Davidson's attempt to render pride, and by extension all of Hume's indirect passions, rationally intelligible fails because it "insists on a form of rationality which is not illuminating in the context, and which is not necessary for an understanding and assessment of the emotional experience in question."[37] What we shall see is that Taylor rejects Davidson's casting the major premise of his syllogistic account of propositional pride as a universal proposition.

To begin, I shall provide a brief summary of how Davidson arrives at the propositional account that Taylor rejects. Davidson proposes that we view the cause of pride as consisting of (a) a judgment that everyone who exemplifies a certain property is praiseworthy and (b) a belief that one exemplifies that property herself. Taken together, he notes, these logically imply the

---

[35] Davidson, 277.

[36] At least at first glance, however, it strikes me that it would be a mistake to interpret either as having offered an account of what Hume would have said about the rational intelligibility of pride, were he dispelled of some of the problematic aspects of his account. With respect to Taylor's account, it is not at all clear to me that Hume would follow her in exclusively translating into beliefs the explanatory and causal aspects of his theory: to the best of my knowledge, Hume does not provide a clear account of beliefs in the *Treatise*. In addition, it is not straightforwardly clear to me how Hume would handle matters concerning logical form and linguistic expression of propositions that are constitutive of or causally explain an emotion—for Hume's account does not address issues concerning language or meaning.

[37] Taylor, 5.

judgment that one is praiseworthy, which he indicates corresponds with the evaluation that Hume identifies as pride. In syllogistic form:

(M)	All who own a beautiful house are praiseworthy.
(m)	I own a beautiful house.
(C)	I am praiseworthy.

Davidson quickly points out that we must make some adjustments to the syllogism in order to render it consistent with Hume's claim that pride directs one's view to two objects. The first change that Davidson makes is to add a reference to the middle term—which Davidson refers to as "owns a beautiful house"— in the conclusion.[38] The second change involves amending the conclusion so that it reflects the fact that one is not proud of herself, period; rather, in the case in question, one is proud of herself *qua* being the owner of a beautiful house. He suggests as a replacement conclusion, "I am praiseworthy in that I own a beautiful house."

After further deliberation, Davidson makes one final adjustment to the syllogism. This time he modifies the major premise so that it makes explicit that one's approval of those who own a beautiful house pertains specifically to their being owners of beautiful homes. In other words, Davidson wishes to make clear that it is not the case that the emoter generally approves of such individuals; rather, her approval of them is tied to their exemplifying the property of owning a beautiful home—for what she holds in high esteem is being the owner of a beautiful home.[39] Taking into account these revisions, we can recast Davidson's syllogistic account of propositional pride as follows:

---

[38] Another, perhaps preferable, way to state the middle term is as a description: *i.e.*, 'owners of beautiful houses.' On a similar note, it might be preferable to state the minor term as 'all things that are identical to me.'
[39] Davidson, 285.

P1.	All who own a beautiful house are praiseworthy *in that* they own a beautiful house.
P2.	I own a beautiful house.
C.	I am praiseworthy *in that* I own a beautiful house.

Taylor contends that this syllogistic account will not serve to make all instances of pride rationally intelligible given that one can imagine a case in which such a syllogism could suffice as a causally intelligible explanation of an emoter's pride but, at the same time, fail to provide the emoter's reasons for experiencing pride. To be clear, Taylor is not suggesting that people do not hold beliefs that are universal in nature. What she is denying is that these universals always play an integral role in the reasoning processes involved in emotions.

In part, what is driving Taylor's criticism is her recognition that because the emotions in question are all emotions of self-assessment, we have reason to expect the practical reasoning involved in these emotions to include reasons that pertain to one's own values, one's own view of oneself, etc. She explains:

> [T]he person experiencing such an emotion does not just see the situation in evaluative terms, he also assimilates what he values or disvalues into a structure of his achievements or failures as so viewed by him. We therefore have here different dimensions of interconnected assessment: his evaluation of the situation will cause him to alter his view of himself to a lesser or greater degree, though perhaps only temporarily. But also conversely, it is at least very likely that he evaluates the situation as he does because his view of himself is what it is.[40]

In short, Taylor contends that even in those cases in which we have reason to believe ourselves justified in attributing to an emoter some universal belief, if what we are after are those reasons that causally explain and make rationally intelligible from the emoter's point of view her reasons for experiencing a particular emotion, then we have to determine what, if any, role the universal belief played in the emoter's arriving at the identificatory belief that is associated with

---

[40] Taylor, 15.

the emotion in question. According to Taylor, should it be the case that the universal belief plays an integral role in explaining her holding of the identificatory belief, then, and only then, will the universal belief count as one of her reasons for holding the identificatory belief in question.

Taylor acknowledges that this change would, at least in some cases, result in the loss of a deductively valid form. However, this does not worry her, as she believes that there will likely be cases in which gaps in a person's reasons for holding a particular identificatory belief will exist and so suggests that, in such cases, we might need to appeal to a person's beliefs, her preferences, her experiences, etc., in order to make intelligible her emotional experience.

With this framework in place, we are now prepared to explore and critically appraise Taylor's analysis of pride. This shall be the focus of chapter two.

Chapter Two: Pride

Introduction

In this chapter, we shall examine the nature of pride. Pride, in its various forms, involves valuing. In cases in which *X* is proud of *Y*, the emoter's pride is prompted by her judging that someone or something is valuable in a particular way. For example, when an emoter is proud of her beautiful home, the emoter deems valuable something about that beautiful home, whether it be the relationship in which she stands to the home as its owner, the work that she puts into making the home look the way that it does, etc. When an emoter is proud of her daughter for graduating from medical school, the emoter deems valuable something about that particular accomplishment of her daughter, whether it be the determinedness of her daughter that saw her through those grueling years of school, or that the daughter possesses the skills and training to serve others, or the fact that her daughter wishes to spend her life helping others, etc.

The same is true when *X* takes pride in *Y*. For example, when an emoter takes pride in her attention to detail, she judges valuable the care and attention that she pays to the finer details. Or when an emoter takes pride in her being of German ancestry, the emoter judges valuable her linkage to a particular kind of lineage, customs, culture, etc.

Cases like those in which pride might prevent someone from acting—*i.e.*, those that we might characterize as *X*'s being too proud to *Y*—imply valuing. The elderly, lower-to-middle-class woman who is too proud to accept help from her neighbors refuses that help, at least in part, on the basis of her valuing being independent. The dowager whose pride does not allow her to adapt to modern times and dispense with certain formalities, like dressing for dinner, acts this way, at least in part, because she values those formalities in some way.

Moreover, consider what is true when *X* swallows her pride and *Y*s. What is she metaphorically swallowing but something that she values. When a financially savvy woman swallows her pride and acknowledges that she erred in judgment by heavily investing in a start-up company, she is exposing a flaw in herself. That flaw is tied to something that she values. We can imagine that someone in this case might value the reputation that she has as someone who consistently makes sound financial investments. By admitting this mistake, she risks damaging her valued reputation.

Notice that valuing is implicated in those institutions that we deem as having a proud reputation or a proud tradition, as well as in those who are proud to be associated with such institutions. For example, the U.S. Marines pride themselves on being first in battle. From this we might infer their valuing the courage and the high level of skill that are required for going into battle first, as well as the implicit trust that the country has in them to protect its interests. Also consider the recruiting materials for the U.S. Marine Corps, many of which contain the slogan, "The Few. The Proud. The Marines." The images in these recruiting materials depict Marines standing in proud postures—*i.e.*, with pumped up chests and their heads high. Such postures implicate self-value, or self-esteem, as well as esteem for being a part of, or a representative of, the Marines. Implicit is the suggestion that these individuals value their association with the Marine Corps because it itself is valuable. The reference to "The Few" implies that not anyone can become a Marine. It suggests that being a Marine is a particular sort of honor, the sense being that in order to be a Marine, one must be a cut above the rest. So, to be a Marine is to stand amongst a distinguished few.

That pride in general involves valuing seems to be clear. But since what we are after in this chapter is an account of *emotional* pride, we shall narrow our focus to determining the nature

of the role (or roles) that it plays in emotional pride. In general, in this chapter, we shall seek to understand what it means for a person to be proud of herself, another, or some aspect thereof. We shall explore the constraints that exist on the possible causal-objects of pride. We shall seek to characterize the kinds of judgments that prompt experiences of emotional pride. In addition, we shall attempt to characterize the judgment that constitutes emotional pride.

The two accounts of pride on which I shall primarily focus are Hume's account of pride in Book 2 ("Of the Passions") of the *Treatise*[1] and Gabriele Taylor's oft-cited contemporary account of pride in *Pride, Shame, and Guilt: Emotions of Self-Assessment*.[2] To begin, I shall provide a summary of Hume's account, including brief remarks about how contemporary writers have appraised it. Next, I shall introduce Taylor's account. Besides highlighting Hume's influence on Taylor's account, I shall explain some of the ways in which Taylor chooses to depart from Hume. In the course of discussing Taylor, I shall begin to address the issues I have identified above.

Hume's Account of Pride

Like a number of other philosophers who have written on pride—Páll Árdal, Donald Davidson, and Gabriele Taylor, to name a few—my interest in, and my own views on, pride are

---

[1] David Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature: A Critical Edition*, ed. David Fate Norton and Mary J. Norton, vol. 1, *Texts*, *The Clarendon Edition of the Works of David Hume*, ed. Tom L. Beauchamp, David Fate Norton, and M. A. Stewart (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007); hereafter, I will refer to the work as the *Treatise*. Despite the fact that Hume also discusses the emotions in *A Dissertation on the Passions* (first published in 1757 as *Of the Passions*; retitled *A Dissertation on the Passions* in 1758; revised seven times during Hume's lifetime), I shall focus almost exclusively on the account of the emotions that Hume provides in the *Treatise* (published in 1739), as the latter serves as the primary basis for the scholarship on Hume's views on the emotions that I shall bring into my discussion. For those interested in a general discussion of Hume's work on the emotions, I recommend reading Tom L. Beauchamp's "Introduction: A History of Two Dissertations" in *A Dissertation on the Passions; The Natural History of Religion: A Critical Edition*, by David Hume, ed. Tom L. Beauchamp, vol. 5, *The Clarendon Edition of the Works of David Hume*, ed. Tom L. Beauchamp, David Fate Norton, and M. A. Stewart (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007).
[2] Gabriele Taylor, *Pride, Shame, and Guilt: Emotions of Self-Assessment* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985).

largely inspired by Hume's discussion of pride in Book 2 ("Of the Passions") of the *Treatise*, despite its ties to the problematic doctrines of associationism and atomism. A number of writers have explored the ways in which these doctrines undermine Hume's account.[3] For this reason, and also because my chief purpose for including Hume's views on pride is to draw attention to those elements of his account that have influenced contemporary analyses of pride, we shall not discuss what I have referred to as his problematic doctrines. So, in what follows, I shall discuss only some aspects of Hume's analysis of pride, seeking to strike a balance between accurately depicting his account, on the one hand, and not getting mired in discussion of the role that the aforementioned underpinning doctrines play in his account.

Hume's account of pride stands apart from those offered by his contemporaries, like Descartes and Spinoza. While the latter limit their remarks on pride to providing a general definition of it and then some brief remarks about it—commenting mostly on excessive pride— Hume devotes the first part of Book 2 of the *Treatise* (which contains 3 total parts) to examining pride and humility (and shame).[4] His devoting more attention to pride than his contemporaries is, perhaps, a function of his novel approach to classifying the emotions. He divides them into (1) those that are *directly* caused by a perception of good or evil, or a perception of pleasure or pain,

---

[3] For instance, see Lilli Alanen, "The Powers and Mechanisms of the Passions," in *The Blackwell Guide to Hume's "Treatise,"* ed. Saul Traiger (Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2005); Páll S. Árdal, "Hume and Davidson on Pride," *Hume Studies* XV, no. 2 (November 1989); Páll S. Árdal, *Passion and Value in Hume's Treatise*, 2nd ed. (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1989): 7−40; John Bricke, "Emotion and Thought in Hume's *Treatise*," Supplementary Volume, *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 1, pt. 1 (1974); Stephen Buckle, "Hume on the Passions," *Philosophy* 87, no. 2 (April 2012); Robert W. Burch, "Hume on Pride and Humility," *The New Scholasticism* 49 (September 1, 1975); and Patrick Gardiner, "Hume's Theory of the Passions," in *David Hume: A Symposium*, ed. D. F. Pears (London: Macmillan, 1966).

[4] While Hume pairs pride with humility, many of his remarks about the latter seem to pertain to shame, or at least the emotion to which we refer when using the word 'shame.' As a result, I shall use 'shame' (and its related forms) in this discussion. It is not clear whether Hume thinks that there is a difference between humility and shame. To the best of my knowledge, Hume never uses the word 'humiliated' or 'humiliation' in the *Treatise*. However, he employs 'asham'd' at least three times (2.1.8.8.18, 2.1.9.3.17, and 2.1.9.10.3) and 'shame' at least once (2.1.10.12.1) in the course of his discussion. As for *A Dissertation on the Passions*, I failed to find any uses of 'humiliated' or 'shame'; yet, I found one use of 'humiliation" (2.44.4), and three uses of 'ashamed' (2.26.3, 2.44.10, and 2.45.1).

and (2) those that are *indirectly* caused by one of these perceptions, along with an idea of some subject in which the quality of good/evil or pleasure/pain in question inheres. Examples of the former group, the direct passions, include desire, aversion, grief, joy, hope, fear, despair, and security. Examples of the latter group, the indirect passions, include pride, humility (and shame), ambition, vanity, love, hatred, envy, pity, malice, and generosity.

According to Hume, one of the important differences between the direct and indirect passions is that each of the indirect passions, when prompted, directs the emoter's attention toward a particular person or persons (what Hume refers to as the 'object' of an emotion). For instance, he claims that love, hatred, pity, and malice always direct the emoter's attention to another person or other persons.[5] In the cases of pride and humility (and shame), he states that the emoter's attention is self-directed. This is not to say that Hume does not think that one can be proud or ashamed of other individuals. Besides acknowledging that one can be proud or ashamed of her children, her family, and her friends, he recognizes that she can be proud or ashamed of a whole host of different aspects of herself or others, including physical appearance, physical or athletic abilities, mental abilities, character, possessions (houses, furniture, gardens, clothing), lineage, endeavors or undertakings (even extending to gatherings like parties), and social standing.[6] Furthermore, he notes that one can be proud or ashamed of her country or aspects thereof.[7] Yet, importantly, according to Hume, regardless of whether one is proud or ashamed of herself, another, others, her country, or some aspect of the aforementioned, necessarily, her ultimate focus will be on herself:

---

[5] Hume, *Treatise*, 2.2.1.2 and 2.2.7.1.4–5. Hume notes in 2.2.1.2 that self-love is not a proper case of love, but a different kind of phenomenon. He considers the same to be true for hatred that one might direct toward herself.
[6] *Ibid*., 2.1.2.5., 2.1.5.2.1–8, 2.1.5.9.7–11, 2.1.6.2.4–6, 2.1.8.1–5, 2.1.9.1.5–6, and 2.1.9.12.
[7] *Ibid*., 2.1.2.5.10–12 and 2.1.9.6–9.

’Tis always self, which is the object of pride and humility; and whenever the passions look beyond, ’tis still with a view to ourselves, nor can any person or object otherwise have any influence upon us.[8]

In addition to the self’s being that on which an emoter will focus, whenever she experiences pride or shame, the self serves as a constraint on the kinds of things or persons that can prompt one to be proud or ashamed. For on Hume’s account, in order for someone or something to serve as the cause of one’s pride or shame, that person or thing must be related to, or bear some relationship to, her. He later develops this point, stipulating that if the cause is not herself or some aspect or herself, then the cause must be some entity that is “nearly related” to her—*i.e.*, some entity with which she shares a close relationship—or some aspect of that entity.[9] He introduces further constraints on the possible causes of pride and shame; we will discuss these later on in our analysis. For our present purpose, what is important is that Hume restricts the causes of pride and shame to only those persons or things with which the emoter shares a close relationship. What this means is that anyone or anything to which the emoter fails to have a close connection cannot serve as the cause of pride or shame.

Hume imposes other restrictions on the causes of pride and shame. For one, Hume stipulates that the cause of pride must be something that one finds pleasing and the cause of shame something unpleasant, or painful. He claims that the cause must be something that is either unique to her or, at least, relatively rare, such that in being closely related to it, she has sufficiently distinguished herself from others.[10] In addition, he requires that it be “very discernible and obvious” to the emoter and to others.[11] Furthermore, he believes that the length

---

[8] Hume, *Treatise*, 2.1.3.2.4–6.
[9] *Ibid.*, 2.1.5.2.3 and 2.1.6.3.3–4.
[10] *Ibid.*, 2.1.6.4–5.
[11] *Ibid.*, 2.1.6.6.

of time that one has been associated with someone or something, as well as the extent to which the association has been uninterrupted, bear on whether it can serve as a cause of pride.[12] In short, one's having a brief, or casual, connection to something fails to meet the requisite conditions for being a source of pride. Hume observes that things to which one is connected for a (relatively) short time in her life tend not to serve as causes for one's pride. In some cases, he suggests, the reason for this is that the entities themselves, being only momentarily connected with the emoter, will fail even to bring her much joy. And, even in cases in which an object with which one shares a short-lived relationship does bring an emoter joy, Hume claims that there is little chance that it will cause her to be proud: for, he explains, one cannot have a sufficiently close relationship to something to which one has only a fleeting or relatively brief relationship.

Finally, he offers a few general observations about pride and shame. The one that clearly seems to be correct concerns how we develop particular preferences toward certain things and not others. Hume notes that societal customs and trends often dispose us to evaluate particular things favorably and others unfavorably.[13] I take it that Hume would agree that another influence on our preferences comes from the preferences of those individuals whom we admire.

So, in broad strokes, Hume's causal account of pride claims that when one perceives a particular pleasing quality in herself or in some entity that is closely related to her, she will, in turn, experience a pleasant feeling and think of herself. The same general story holds true for shame, with the notable difference being that the quality that she perceives in the cause and, as a result, feels when she thinks of herself is negative.[14]

While his account itself fails to imply that pride and shame are modes of self-evaluation,

---

[12] Hume, *Treatise*, 2.1.6.7.
[13] *Ibid.*, 2.1.6.9.9–13.
[14] *Ibid.*, 2.1.5.8.13–14 and 2.1.5.9.1–7.

it appears that this is how he envisions them. Some words and phrases that he uses to describe pride and shame, include: "vanity,"[15] "satisfaction in ourselves,"[16] "self-applause,"[17] "self-value,"[18] and "self-esteem."[19] A couple of the phrases that he uses to describe shame include "dissatisfaction with ourselves"[20] and "sensible mortification."[21] Thus, we might think of Hume as seeking to provide a causal account that holds the following: Pride, being prompted by one's perceiving as pleasing some aspect of herself, or of an entity that is closely related to her, involves her viewing herself in a pleasant way. Shame, being prompted by her perceiving as painful some aspect of an entity that is closely related to her, involves her viewing herself in a negative way.

Taylor (et al.) on Hume; Taylor on Pride

At this point, I shall drop shame from our discussion—returning to it in the next chapter—and narrow our focus to considering the nature of pride. Before we proceed in our examination of Taylor's assessment of Hume's account of pride and our examination of the account of pride that she herself offers, it is important to register that Taylor's aim is to produce a list of necessary and sufficient conditions for rationally intelligible instances of pride. What this means is that her account is intended to explain only those instances of pride in which we are able to ascribe to the emoter in question certain attitudes. The attitudes in question must include

[15] Hume, *Treatise*, 2.1.6.2.6, 2.1.6.4.14, and 2.1.7.7.4. These are three of many occurrences of 'vanity' in the *Treatise*. For some of the uses of 'vanity' in *A Dissertation on the Passions*, see 2.16.17, 2.25.8, and 2.36.3,
[16] Hume, *A Dissertation on the Passions*, 2.1.4.
[17] *Ibid*., 2.11. 8; and Hume, *Treatise*, 2.1.6.2.6.
[18] Hume, *A Dissertation on the Passions*, 2.11.26.
[19] Hume, *Treatise*, 2.2.1.9.4.
[20] Hume, *A Dissertation on the Passions*, 2.1.5–6.
[21] Hume, *Treatise*, 2.1.7.7.6. Hume does not analyze shame ('humility') itself at much length. He conducts most of his analysis of pride and shame by considering what is true of pride. In many instances, his remarks about shame are limited to the assertion that what holds of pride is the opposite for shame. As a result, he provides far fewer descriptions of shame than he does for pride.

an attitude that identifies that what the emoter is experiencing is pride, rather than some other kind of emotion. Plus, they must include a set of attitudes that represent her reasons for holding the aforementioned attitude. Besides the obvious virtue of enabling us to distinguish between cases of rationally intelligible and non-rationally intelligible pride, such an account suggests that it might be possible to evaluate the reasonableness of rationally intelligible instances of pride.[22]

On two significant points, Taylor agrees with Hume. First, she agrees that every case of pride involves one's placing her focus on herself. She states,

> Pride in all its forms concerns the status of the self. The different forms of pride can be explained and related to each other by reference to the view the agent takes of himself and his standing.[23]

The second substantial point on which she agrees with Hume is that pride is a mode of positive self-evaluation. On her account, pride is a positive emotion of self-assessment. But although she follows Hume in conceiving of pride as a self-directed evaluative state, she rejects Hume's claim that the causes of pride, and that pride itself, will always be pleasurable.[24] *Contra* Hume's suggestion that one will feel proud of anything to which one bears a sufficiently 'close' relation *and* which one finds pleasing,[25] Taylor rightly points out that some pleasurable things to which one bears a 'close' relationship can cause one to feel bad about oneself. We might imagine someone who, despite taking delight in her newly renovated kitchen, feels guilty for having done the renovations—for perhaps she had to deplete her retirement savings in order to pay for the new kitchen.

Furthermore, she, like a number of other commentators, argues that Hume's referring to

---

[22] Taylor, 22–23. Taylor insists that these attitudes be expressed as beliefs. I am not convinced that this is so; hence, I have described them in more generic terms. As a result, should any confusion arise because of this, that is my fault—not Taylor's.
[23] *Ibid.*
[24] *Ibid.*, 24–25.
[25] Hume, *Treatise*, 2.1.5.8.13−14.

the emoter's positive feeling toward the object-cause of her pride as "a pleasant sensation"[26] fails

to capture the requisite kind of appraisal that pride involves.[27] She proposes that positive feeling

that one must feel toward the object-cause must amount to her valuing that object-cause, where

one's valuing X is consistent with her finding X pleasing, but does not entail it.[28] In addition to

believing that pride entails the emoter's valuing the object-cause of her pride (or some aspect

thereof), Taylor adds that it also entails her valuing the 'close' relationship that she has to, or

with, it. This additional judgment of value is supposed to bridge the connection between the

valuable object-cause and the emoter herself, so that the focus of her pride is on her valuing

herself, in virtue of her standing in this particular valuable relationship with that object-cause.

Lastly, Taylor, like others, abandons Hume's claim that the emoter's experience of pride

itself be pleasant. Instead, she focuses on the nature of the judgment that is constitutive of

pride—*i.e.*, that identifies an emoter's being in the emotional state of pride, instead of some other

emotional state—and claims that it comprises a favorable judgment of self-value. Specifically,

she states that emotional pride constitutes an emoter's assessing that her self-worth (or some

aspect thereof) has been "confirmed or enhanced."[29]

As I indicated in the opening remarks of this chapter, I agree with Taylor that pride

necessarily involves valuing. While I agree that one must view the cause of her pride, as well as

its relationship to her, valuable, I disagree that the judgment associated with emotional pride is

an emoter's judging that she herself has increased in value. For the moment, I shall temporarily

---

[26] Hume, *Treatise*, 2.1.5.8.13−14.

[27] For instance, see Árdal, "Hume and Davidson on Pride," 388; Árdal, *Passion and Value in Hume's "Treatise,"* 2nd ed., 27−28; and Davidson, "Hume's Cognitive Theory of Pride," 279−84.

[28] Taylor, 25. To be clear, we value things despite their being painful or devoid of pleasure: going to the dentist, getting vaccines, etc. In addition, many things that we find pleasurable fail to be things that we value: soaking one's feet in warm water, eating ice cream on a hot summer's day, etc.

[29] *Ibid.*, 35. Note the emphasis that she places on representing the emoter's attitudes.

set aside this concern. For there are a number of points on which I agree with Taylor, and I think that having these points in place shall provide better context for discussing this aforementioned discussion. Thus, we shall turn our attention to matters concerning the objects of pride.

The Objects of Pride

Taylor uses Hume's basic account of pride as a means for presenting her own account. She agrees with Hume that the causes of pride can be only those things with which the emoter (actually) shares a 'close' relationship. However, she notes that beyond briefly explaining why the master of a feast, but not a mere attendee of the feast, can be proud of its success, Hume does not provide any sense of what he believes this relationship to require.[30] In an attempt to make this 'close' relationship more explicit, Taylor considers what Hume might have envisioned the 'close' relationship to require, as well as what kind of connection she believes the emoter must judge to exist between the cause of her pride and herself. Ultimately, Taylor settles on the notion of 'belonging,' proposing that in order for one to be proud of *X* (or some aspect thereof), the emoter "must believe that the relation of belonging in one of its various forms holds between [*X* and herself]."[31] While she does not explicitly enumerate the forms of 'belonging,' her discussion suggests that they include:

1. *X* and her belonging to the same family, country, institution, etc.; and

2. *X*'s belonging to her, whether it be in virtue of:

---

[30] Taylor, 21. For Hume's discussion of the feast example, see *Treatise*, 2.1.6.2. Taylor rightly points out that none of the limitations that Hume offers in 2.1.6.3–8 provides helpful guidance with respect to the matter at hand. See Taylor, 25–32.

[31] *Ibid.*, 32.

a. Her owning *X* (*e.g.*, a luxury car);

b. Her possessing *X* (*e.g.*, having porcelain skin or having perfect pitch);

    c. Her being at least partially responsible for *X*'s existence (*e.g.*, by having sewn the quilt or given birth to the child) or occurrence (*e.g.*, by having coordinated the successful fundraising event); or

    d. Her being at least partially responsible for *X*'s possessing some attribute or property (*e.g.*, by fostering generosity in her daughter or by playing an integral role in Illinois's abolishing the death penalty).[32]

The chief virtue of the relation of belonging is that it is broad enough to capture the many different ways in which we are connected to the causes of our pride, which, in turn, sheds light on the various aspects of those things to which we stand in such a relation that can serve as the object of our pride. She explains:

> It is in virtue of belonging to the same family, the same country or institution that people are proud of their ancestors, countrymen, or colleagues. The belonging may be quite straightforward, as it is between me and my house. Or it may hold the other way about: my belonging to a nation or institution makes that nation or institution and its belongings a possible object of pride for me. Or again, in belonging to some country or institution, others who also belong to that country or institution may present themselves as something to be proud of. The relation of belonging operates in various directions and all of them can be exploited from the point of view of feeling proud. It can be the basis for pride in quite different ways: I may, but need not think of my son or grandfather as my belongings in order to be proud of them, nor need I think of their desirable qualities as something I have helped to bring about in order to be proud of these. I need not, for example, regard my grandfather's wit as something I am at least partially responsible for; rather more sanely, I may see him as sharing with me the relation of 'belonging to the same family.' This allows me to identify with him as a member of that family and see his belongings as something in which I have a share and so can be proud of. On similar bases I may be proud of my son's cleverness, my father's riches, or my country's prosperity.[33]

Having described the attitude that she associates with, or identifies as picking out the emotional

---

[32] Taylor, 27–35. The examples provided are my own.
[33] *Ibid.*, 30.

state of, pride, as well as the attitudes that she believes serve to render that state rationally

intelligible, Taylor summarizes her account of pride as follows:

> [A] person who experiences pride believes that she stands in the relation of belonging to some object (person, deed, state) which she thinks desirable in some respect. This is the general description of the explanatory beliefs. It is because (in her view) this relation holds between her and the desirable object that she believes her worth to be increased, in the relevant respect. This belief is constitutive of the feeling of pride. The gap between the explanatory and identificatory beliefs is bridged by the belief that her connection to the thing in question is itself of value, or is an achievement of hers.[34]

What it means for an emoter to view something as "an achievement of hers" is that she deems

that thing to be something that exceeds her own sense of what she is justified to expect of, or for,

herself. Thus, the norm of expectations that govern an emoter's feelings of pride are hers. While

we might imagine that her society's (or others') norms might influence which norms she adopts,

in the end, the norms that *she* adopts are those that determine whether or not she views

something as an achievement.[35]

Why Pride is Not Best Understood as an Emotion of Self-Assessment

As I indicated above, the main point of disagreement I have with Taylor concerns her

view that pride necessarily involves judging that one's "own worth is confirmed or enhanced."[36]

I acknowledge that some cases in which an emoter's pride is prompted by something that she has

accomplished can be construed as cases that involve the emoter's making a favorable self-

assessment. Where I disagree is that I do not think that the same thing can be said for all cases of

emotional pride. And I think that we can show this by examining cases of other-directed pride.

For instance, we might imagine someone who is proud of a neighborhood child for winning the

---

[34] Taylor, 42.
[35] *Ibid.*, 41.
[36] *Ibid.*, 24.

school district's spelling bee, someone who is proud of her city leaders for breaking with the city's long-standing tradition of catering to powerful developers and enforcing zoning guidelines, or someone who is proud of her best friend for making the radical life changes that have resulted in her friend's losing 167 pounds and adding decades to her life expectancy. As outlined, none of these three cases necessitates the emoter's taking a particular view of herself, due to her feeling proud.

Of course, we could amend each case in ways that would provide grounds for the emoter's pride's implying a boost to her view of herself. Perhaps in the first example, the emoter believes that it was her having reviewed spelling lists with the neighborhood child that contributed to the child's having won the spelling bee, thereby making her at least in part responsible for the child's victory. Perhaps, in the second, the emoter spent months or years lobbying the city leaders to enforce zoning guidelines, thereby providing her with reason to take some credit for the leaders' actions. Finally, perhaps, in the third case, the emoter views her best friend's success as elevating her own status because she believes that her having given her best friend a year's worth of one-on-one training sessions with a personal trainer is what jumpstarted her best friend on the path to healthy living. By adding these details to each case, we have provided a connection between the emoter and the valued accomplishment or action that would enable her to see herself as sharing in the glory of the particular outcomes.

But if we consider our original cases, there is no reason to believe that her feeling proud of the individuals in question necessarily involves her judging her own status to be elevated. And theories that do misconstrue—in particular, they cheapen—the value that the emoter places on these individuals. For such theories imply that the emoter values these individuals merely

because they benefit her, by elevating her status.[37] But surely this is an overly pessimistic view of human nature. The third of these cases is semi-autobiographical in that my best friend did make drastic life changes which resulted in her losing 167 pounds. I am immensely proud of her for doing so; however, I would not say that I believe that her success in any way boosts my own status. While I am quick to sing her praises for this accomplishment and show her off to others, I would not interpret my doing such things as evidence that I see my worth (or the part of my worth that stems from the friendship that I value) increased.

To bring into better focus why it would be incorrect to characterize my pride in this way, let us consider how Taylor would have us understand such a case. As you will recall, Taylor interprets the identificatory belief associated with pride as a belief that one is worthy in some particular light or that one's worth has in some way been validated or increased. As for the explanatory beliefs, she believes that the following three beliefs are both necessary and sufficient: (1) a belief that the cause of one's pride is, in some aspect, valuable;[38] (2) a belief that she stands in a particular kind of close relationship with the cause of her pride; and (3) a belief that the close relationship that she shares with the cause of her pride is itself valuable.[39] Unfortunately, Taylor does not provide a specific example of how she thinks such beliefs might be stated. But I gather that she would interpret an instance of an emoter's being proud of herself

---

[37] Bennett Helm echoes this sentiment, stating:
> To deny that emotions like pride and shame are essentially reflexive is therefore to reject the idea that the concern involved in pride and shame is essentially derived from the contribution made by the object of that concern to one's own well-being—a kind of egocentrism implicit in standard accounts of pride and shame…. (Bennett W. Helm, "Love, Identification, and the Emotions," *American Philosophical Quarterly*, 46, no. 1 [January 2009]: 46.)

[38] In some cases, she uses 'desirable' in place of 'valuable.' See Taylor, 32.

[39] Later, Taylor suggests that one could combine the second and third explanatory beliefs by adding an additional stipulation to the requirements that govern what kind of relationship must exist between the emoter and that of which she is proud—namely, that "the desirable belonging has to be seen from a certain point of view, as a candidate for playing a certain kind of role in the person's self-related expectations" (*Ibid*., 42). Interestingly, despite seemingly approving of such a change, she does not adopt it herself.

for being the owner of a beautiful house as follows:

EB1.   I believe that this house, insofar as it is a beautiful house, is valuable.
EB2.   I believe that I am the owner of this beautiful house.
EB3.   I believe that my being the owner of this beautiful house is itself valuable.
IB.   In view of my being the owner of this beautiful house, my self-worth is confirmed or enhanced.

On face value, this strikes me as being more or less plausible. So, for the sake of argument, let us accept that this adequately characterizes the emoter who takes pride in her owning a beautiful house. Notice, however, what happens when we use this framework in an attempt to make rationally intelligible my being proud of my best friend's having lost 167 pounds and adding decades to her life expectancy:

EB1.   I believe that Sharon, insofar as she has lost 167 pounds and added decades to her life expectancy, is valuable.
EB2.   I believe that I am the best friend of Sharon, who lost 167 pounds and added decades to her life.
EB3.   I believe that my being the best friend of Sharon, who lost 167 pounds and added decades to her life, is valuable or desirable.
IB.   In view of my being the best friend of Sharon, who lost 167 pounds and added decades to her life, my self-worth is confirmed or enhanced.

Does this seem plausible? As the person who feels proud of Sharon for having lost 167 pounds and adding decades to her life expectancy, I *not only reject it as* a plausible representation of my reasons for being proud of Sharon, but I find it to be an especially cynical interpretation of human emotion.

This case and the other two cases of other-directed pride illustrate that we can (and do) take a special interest in certain individuals' lives, and that we do so in virtue of our seeing them as being importantly connected to, or 'belonging' to, us. In each of these cases, the emoter's pride implies more than her approving of, or being pleased with, the actions or accomplishments of the person(s) in question. Her pride implies that she takes a special kind of satisfaction in the

42

state of affairs in question. In these cases the satisfaction she takes comes from her believing that her expectations of and desires for the individual(s) in question—*i.e.*, the person(s) she views as 'belonging' to her—have been met or exceeded in some meaningful way.

It strikes me that satisfaction—or a sense of fulfillment—is at the heart of self-directed cases of shame, too. Consider Emily, an abused wife, who believes that, for the first time, her husband is about to physically attack their young daughter. Emily believes herself to be physically incapable of preventing the attack and suspects that any attempt on her part to prevent the attack could result both in her child's, and herself, being harmed. At the same time, in virtue of being a mother, Emily considers of utmost importance her responsibility to protect her child from physical harm. Imagine that Emily, despite not being confident about her chances of success, attempts to prevent, and succeeds in preventing, her husband from hitting their child and herself. In response, Emily feels proud of herself.

Emily is proud of herself for not allowing fear to deter her from trying to protect her daughter from harm. She believes that her having attempted to protect her daughter from harm demonstrates, or confirms, the importance that she places on upholding her values. As a result, she feels a certain sort of contentment, or satisfaction, with herself.

Another way we might think about why approval is not a robust enough concept for pride is to consider our motives for telling people we are proud of them, despite the fact that oftentimes we are not expressly proud of them. I have in mind here cases like telling a niece that one is proud of her for graduating from high school, despite, while approving of her having graduated, not considering oneself to be proud of her. Setting aside those cases in which one says that she is proud only because she thinks that it is what society or others expects of her, I interpret such utterances as attempts on the utterer's part to influence the target of her utterance

to act in a particular way or adopt a particular attitude (including valuing) that is consistent with some value of hers. So, in the niece's case, I imagine that in the aunt's telling the niece that she is proud of her, the aunt might be trying to get the niece to come to see the importance of education, form desires for pursuing further education, come to value being an educated person, view her having her high school diploma as a valuable accomplishment in her life, etc. In short, she tells her niece that she is proud of her because she cares about her niece, believes that education is valuable, and hopes that by telling her niece that she is proud of her, she will contribute in some way to promoting the niece's well-being.

Or consider when we tell children that we are proud of them, despite recognizing that children, in not yet being fully autonomous, do not meet the minimal standards for being held responsible for their actions. In my own experience, I have told my 5-year-old neighbor that I am proud of him for doing such things as sitting quietly during a television program, not cheating at Candyland, not crying when he does not get his way, and being able to recognize and write his name.

In my own experience, I observe that despite the fact that in doing such things he has exceeded my expectations of him in those situations and, as a result, done things of which I approve, it is not the case I am actually proud of him. Yes, I am pleased with what he has done. I approve of what he has done. But I am not proud. So why not just tell him that I am glad that he made the decisions that he did? I tell him that I am proud of him because I want him to associate those actions with praiseworthiness. My aim is not to report the fact that I see those actions in a positive light. It is to link such behaviors in his mind with praise, with the hope that he will repeat these behaviors and ultimately develop their associated character traits. In essence, I see those behaviors as instantiations of valuable character traits, and because I care about him and

his future, I am trying to help mold his character.

Question: Can one be proud of individuals that one does not know or that one knows only casually?

Answer: Interestingly, yes and no.

Whether or not one can be proud of another depends on whether one conceives herself to stand in relation to that person in such a way that justifies one's taking special interest in that person's accomplishments. In general, being proud of another requires that one is invested in that other person's future well-being and has had enough interaction with that person so as to develop an understanding of that person's interests, abilities, goals, etc. So, no matter how much delight I may take in seeing a particular English football team succeed against their rivals, because I do not stand in any of the ways of belonging to the members of that team, or to England itself, I cannot be proud of the team. While I can believe that *they* should be proud of themselves for having won, I do not stand in a sufficiently close relationship to them in order to feel proud of them.

On the other hand, I can be proud of any U.S. national team, even if I do not know any of the members, since they are representing my country. This, of course, is not to say that I will, in fact, feel proud of them. It is meant merely to demonstrate that nationality is one of the bases that is strong enough to produce genuine cases of pride.

Chapter Three: Shame

Introduction

In this chapter, we shall examine the nature of emotional shame, or the state of an individual's being (or feeling) ashamed of someone or something. We shall look to Hume's account of pride and humility for insights on shame; however, as we shall see, Hume's remarks about pride and humility do not as straightforwardly pertain to shame as they did pride. We shall also draw on Taylor's discussion of shame, which locates shame within the class of negative emotions of self-assessment, other members of which include embarrassment, humiliation, guilt, and remorse.[1]

Contra Taylor and others, I contend that the evaluative judgment that is associated with shame (*i.e.*, the judgment that identifies an emoter's experiencing shame, and not some other emotion) need not always involve the self-directed evaluative judgment that one's own worth has been compromised. I think that emotional shame can involve self-directed *and* other-directed evaluative judgments. Moreover, I propose that in order to understand shame, we must move beyond conceiving it as primarily consisting of a judgment about some entity's worth. On my view, shame is essentially an emotion of vulnerability. It reflects a person's feelings of helplessness to undo some state of affairs that she believes to bear negatively on some important aspect of herself or some entity that she values (like another person, her country, or her family).

---

[1] Gabriele Taylor's analysis (in her book, *Pride, Shame, and Guilt: Emotions of Self-Assessment*) of the similarities and differences between shame and other negative emotions (like embarrassment, guilt, humiliation, and remorse) is quite stimulating. However, I have decided not to bring in issues pertaining to these other negative emotions into our discussion of shame, fearing that doing so would take us too far afield from the project at hand.

46

We shall begin by looking at Hume's discussion of humility. We shall explore some of the challenges that face our using his remarks on humility in order to explore shame. But we shall also see that there are a number of ways in which his discussion does bear on shame and can be useful in thinking about the nature of shame. I shall focus especially on his views concerning the dissatisfaction that is involved in shame. I shall also bring some of Taylor's views into the discussion, one of which is that shame is best understood as an emotion of self-assessment. As I indicated above, I disagree with Taylor on this point. In this section, I shall demonstrate not only that shame can involve other-assessments, but that shame involves more than assessing oneself or another.

Then, I shall present a basic sketch of shame. I will analyze the objects of shame. I shall offer an account of the nature of the conflict and the subsequent vulnerability that I believe that shame involves. And I shall discuss the kind of dissatisfaction that I believe that shame embodies.

Can We Learn Anything about Shame from Hume's Account of Pride and Humility?

As I noted at the outset of chapter 2, I am not alone in believing that Hume's discussion of pride and humility contains important insights into the nature of emotional pride. A number of contemporary philosophers find Hume's views on pride philosophically rich, once disentangled from the account's atomistic, associationist underpinnings. But even though commentators agree that (many of) Hume's remarks on what he refers to as humility are best understood as pertaining to (what we refer to as) shame,[2] Hume receives very little attention in the contemporary

---

[2] For instance, see Páll S. Árdal, "Another Look at Hume's Account of Moral Evaluation," *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 15, no. 4 (October 1977): 408; and John Bricke, "Emotion and Thought in Hume's *Treatise*," 58. Also,

philosophical literature on shame. I suspect that this stems in part from the fact that his

discussion of humility ranges not only over the emotion of shame, but also other negative

emotions of self-assessment, like embarrassment and humiliation.[3] For despite the titles of the

first two parts of Book 2—"Of pride and humility" and "Of love and hatred," respectively—

Hume's aim in these parts seems to be to explore types, or families, of (affective) person-

directed states, rather than particular (individual) emotions.

     One can easily misinterpret Hume's project in the first two parts of Book 2. Hume's

terminology is misleading, given that he uses the emotion-words of 'pride,' 'humility,' 'love,'

and 'hatred,' in a non-standard sense, in order to refer to different *modes* of person-evaluation.[4]

---

as David Fate Norton and Mary J. Norton point out in their annotations to Book 2, Hume was following in the early modern philosophical tradition by contrasting pride with humility. (David Fate Norton and Mary J. Norton, editors' annotations to *A Treatise of Human Nature* in *A Treatise of Human Nature: A Critical Edition*, ed. David Fate Norton and Mary J. Norton, vol. 2 [2007; repr., Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011], 823.)

[3] Robert Burch nicely draws attention to the diversity amongst the states on the negative side. He states:

> By 'pride' Hume means the feeling that someone has when he is proud of or vain about something. He does not mean the character trait of being a proud man. By 'humility' Hume means the feeling of humiliation, embarrassment, or shame. He does not mean the character trait of humbleness or modesty. (Burch, 177)

[4] A number of scholars comment on Hume's using emotion words in a nonconventional way. Páll Árdal cautions:

> In reading the *Treatise* one has to be alive to the fact that Hume gives certain crucial words new meanings. He does not always draw the reader's attention to this and sometimes explicitly claims to be using terms with their ordinary meanings when he is clearly giving the words special technical uses by expanding or contracting their usual meanings. 'Passion,' 'love,' 'hatred,' and 'humility' have special meanings in Hume's psychological scheme. He also sometimes uses important terms with more than one meaning, as in the case of 'justice.' …The following two questions should be borne in mind: 'What did Hume have to say about what **he** calls justice, passion, love, etc.?" and "What did Hume have to say about what **we** refer to by the same terms? (Páll S. Árdal, "Hume and Davidson on Pride," 387.)

Elsewhere, Árdal states:

> In [Hume's] choice of words to stand for the four indirect passions of his scheme Hume has decided upon terms that are related in meaning to the technical sense his account requires. It is unfortunate that Hume himself is partly responsible for the mistaken view that he is analyzing the very emotions that, independently of his theory, are called love, hatred, pride and humility. (Páll S. Árdal, introduction to the second edition of *Passion and Value in Hume's Treatise*, 2nd ed., xix.)

In a footnote, John Bricke notes:

> Hume's terms for the several affections often do not comport very happily with contemporary usage. It is best to think of these as technical terms intended to be unusually comprehensive in scope. '*Terror, consternation, astonishment, anxiety*, and other passions of that kind,' Hume writes, 'are nothing but different species and degrees of fear' (*T* 447 [2.3.9.31.3−5]). Referring to the 'sub-divisions of the other affections' he illustrates his practice by writing: 'Love may shew itself in the shape of *tenderness, friendship, intimacy, esteem, good-will*, and in many other appearances; which at the bottom are the same affections, and arise from the same causes, tho' with a small variation, which it is not necessary to give any particular account of' (*T* 448 [2.3.9.31.8−12]).

In addition, his choosing to begin his analysis of the passions with pride and humility does not help to clarify the scope of his examination.[5] He overwhelmingly casts his discussion of pride and humility in terms of what is true of pride;[6] and it turns out that a fair amount of what Hume has to say about *what he refers to* as pride seems to bear on *what we refer to* as pride.[7] So, even if, at the outset, one suspects that Hume is using 'pride,' 'humility,' 'love,' and 'hatred' in a special, unconventional sense, one might lose sight of this, since so much of Hume's discussion of pride seems applicable to what we refer to as pride. And if one falsely assumes that Hume is using 'pride,' 'humility,' 'love,' and 'hatred' conventionally, one might conclude that what Hume refers to as humility is, more or less, what we refer to as shame. However, a close reading

---

(John Bricke, *Mind and Morality: An Examination of Hume's Moral Psychology* [New York: Oxford University Press, 1996]: 37n1.)

[5] David Fate Norton and Mary J. Norton suggest that even though modern philosophers interested in the passions typically contrasted pride with humility, there was no consensus on the meaning of these terms. They state:

> Pride and humility were widely discussed in the early modern philosophical literature on the passions, where they were commonly treated as an antithetical pair. There was not, however, widespread agreement about the meaning of the terms or even about which terms to use. Descartes, for example, treated pride and humility as subspecies of self-esteem and self-contempt (*Passions of the Soul* 2.54, 3.150−2). Hobbes treated pride as a subspecies of 'Glory, or internal gloriation or triumph of the mind,' saying that 'this passion, by them whom it displeaseth, is called pride: by them whom it pleaseth, it is termed a just valuation of himself;' humility he treated in a similar way (*Elements of Law* 9.1−2). (David Fate Norton and Mary J. Norton, editors' annotations to *A Treatise of Human Nature*, 823)

In this note, they also recommend one's examining other modern accounts, including those of Vives, Charleton, Spinoza, and H. More. I grant that these differences exist. However, I think that Hume's use of 'pride' and 'humility' (among other terms) deserves a special caution. For unlike the above-mentioned philosophers, Hume provides very few prefatory remarks about his aims in examining the passions. Plus, in view of his conceiving of the passions as simple impressions, Hume does not provide definitions of the passion-terms that he uses. Instead, he explains:

> [A]s these words, *pride* and *humility*, are of general use, and the impressions they represent the most common of any, every one, of himself, will be able to form a just idea of them, without any danger of mistake For which reason, not to lose time upon preliminaries, I shall immediately enter upon the examination of these passions. (Hume, *Treatise*, 2.1.2.4−9)

He offers the same kind of remarks at the beginning of part 2 (see 2.2.1).

[6] For instance, almost without exception, Hume's examples in the *Treatise* pertain to pride: *e.g.*, the proud owner of the beautiful house (2.1.2.6.3−9 and 2.1.5.9.7−13), the proud master of a feast (2.1.6.2.3−11), the person who is proud of her wealth, country of origin, deep ancestral roots, and so forth (2.1.9.6−13).

[7] Árdal comments:

> …[Hume] did not find passions named in English that clearly constitute the kind of evaluation of ourselves or others that he was looking for. This is why the names of his four basic indirect passions are, in the *Treatise*, technical terms.…When the emotions they ordinarily name come close to being identifiable with Hume's indirect passions his account throws light upon their nature. This is why his account of pride in Book II is so

of the text demonstrates that this is not so.

In some places, Hume appears to be commenting on self-esteem, or taking a favorable or unfavorable view of oneself. In the following passage, for instance, he seems to be describing some of the common causes of high or low self-esteem:

> [T]he good and bad qualities of our actions and manners constitute virtue and vice, and determine our personal character, than which nothing operates more strongly on these passions. In like manner, 'tis the beauty or deformity of our person, houses, equipage, or furniture, by which we are render'd either vain or humble. The same qualities, when transferr'd to subjects, which bear us no relation, influence not in the smallest degree either of these affections.[8]

The notion of *being rendered humble* by what we look like and what we own, also brings to mind social hierarchy, and how societies determine an individual's worth based on matters pertaining to lineage, wealth, possessions, looks, etc. Within such systems, those who occupy lowly positions are considered humble. Of course, one can acknowledge that she has a humble position in society and, at the same time, not have low self-esteem.[9] But, generally-speaking,

---

illuminating. (Páll S. Árdal, "Another Look at Hume's Account of Moral Evaluation," 421)

[8] Hume, *Treatise*, 2.1.5.2.4–9.

[9] In the context of analyzing the similarities and differences between the *proud* man and the *humble* man, as ranked within a hierarchical society, Taylor notes that a person's social status can be *objectively* downgraded in a couple of ways: besides being humbled, the person could be humiliated, too. She writes:

> Humbling a person is the more neutral move, it consist simply in the downgrading of status for whatever reason. But intending to humiliate this person is in addition meant to show the world that he is worthy of less esteem than he had either been given or had assumed he deserved.

Taylor continues in this passage, by emphasizing that the way in which the person reacts to having her status downgraded is a separate matter:

> Such objective humbling or humiliating need not be accompanied by a corresponding attitude on the part of him who suffered such a fate. …Where…a person does feel humbled this can be seen as the exact counterpart to the objective downward move. He feels humbled if, having previously regarded his higher position as the proper one, he now accepts the lower position as his due. He may think either that he had formerly taken an exaggerated view of his merits, or that, for some reason or other, his merits are now not what they once were. In either case, feeling humbled involves a downward revision of the agent's view of himself, parallel to the downgrading of his status. Feeling humiliated, on the other hand, does not imply the agent's acceptance of the new situation; his own view of himself and what is due to him may not change at all. But whether it does or not, he is aware that in the eyes of the world less is now due to him than was assumed or was formerly the case, and aware that to the eyes of the world he has been shown to have suffered from exaggerated self-esteem. (Taylor, 18−19)

these are some of the considerations that factor into one's having high or low self-esteem. But

having a low self-esteem is not the same thing as feeling ashamed.

The affective (evaluative) response described in the following passage seems consistent

with humiliation:

> Nothing flatters our vanity more than the talent of pleasing by our wit, good humour, or any other accomplishment; and nothing gives us a more sensible mortification than a disappointment in any attempt of that nature.[10]

What comes to my mind is an established comedian who reacts with horror, when an audience

turns on her. This person seems concerned not with how she views herself, but with how others

view, and judge, her. One might wonder whether the passage (also) describes a state that is

consistent with feeling embarrassed. For in the moment when she realizes that she has failed to

please by her wit, she might feel insecure about how she should respond. In a comedian's case,

once her material begins to fail, she might not know how to respond: should she continue with

her set, should she try to improvise, etc.

Even in the faces of these two challenges—(1) that Hume offers very few direct remarks

about humility and (2) what Hume refers to as humility ranges over more than one negative

evaluative state—I think that we can learn some interesting things about emotional shame from

Hume's discussion of pride and humility. Some of these insights are carryovers from our

discussion of Hume on pride. Others stem directly from his observations about shame.

What We Can Learn about Shame from Hume

As we noted in chapter 2, Hume believes that the object-causes of pride and shame are

---

[10] Hume, *Treatise*, 2.1.7.7.4−6.

objects that are "nearly related"—or bear a 'close' connection—to the emoter herself.[11]

Ultimately, one must go beyond Hume's analysis in order to find a suitable characterization of

the kind of 'close' connection that shame necessitates. Yet, Hume's observations reveal the wide

variety of things that might serve as the object of one's pride or shame.

> ...[T]ho pride and humility have the qualities of our mind and body, that is *self*, for their natural and more immediate causes, we find by experience, that there are many other objects, which produce these affections, and that the primary one is, in some measure, obscur'd and lost by the multiplicity of foreign and extrinsic. We found a vanity upon houses, gardens, equipages, as well as upon personal merit and accomplishments; and tho' these external advantages be in themselves widely distant from thought of a person, yet they considerably influence even a passion, which is directed to that as its ultimate object. This happens when external objects acquire a particular relation to ourselves, and are associated or connected with us.[12]

Put in terms of categories, or classes, what we glean from Hume is that one can be proud or

ashamed of oneself, one's family, or one's friends. One can be proud or ashamed of some aspect

of oneself, one's family, or one's friends: *e.g.*, physical appearance, abilities (physical, athletic,

or mental), character, pursuits, status (economic or social), possessions, lineage, or nationality.[13]

Moreover, one can be proud or ashamed of her country or her nationality (or some aspect

thereof).

In chapter 2, we explored Taylor's analysis of this 'close' relationship. We considered a

number of candidate descriptions of the relationship and ultimately agreed with Taylor, that the

requisite relationship in pride seems to be the relation of 'belonging.' According to this relation,

one can proud of anyone or anything that she:

1. Identifies as hers, on the basis of their belonging (*i.e.*, the emoter and the entity-object

   in question) to the same family, country, nationality, institution, etc.;

---

[11] *Ibid*, 2.1.5.8.13−14.
[12] Hume, *Treatise*, 2.1.9.1−10.

2. Owns (*e.g.*, a beautiful house);

3. Possesses (*e.g.*, a quick wit);

4. Is at least partially responsible for, in terms of having brought about its existence or its occurrence (*e.g.*, a sonata that she composed or a city-wide art fair that she planned); and

5. Is at least partially responsible for, in terms of its possessing some attribute or property (*e.g.*, a former student's appreciation of fine art or a park's having accessible equipment for children with disabilities).

Taylor believes that the relation of 'belonging' also governs the kinds of things that can serve as the objects of shame, too.[14] I agree, and shall provide some examples for each form of 'belonging.'

In chapter 2, we also addressed two particular missteps in Hume's account—namely, his claims that (1) the causes of pride necessarily feel pleasant,[15] and that (2) pride itself necessarily feels pleasant.[16] Following Taylor's lead, we saw that neither the causes of emotional pride nor the state of experiencing emotional pride must feel a particular way to the emoter. Instead, both of these require the emoter's evaluating them in a favorable way. As for the causes of emotional pride, they must be things that one believes to reflect favorably on oneself, or on an entity with whom one stands in the relationship of belonging. And as for emotional pride itself, it comprises one's taking a favorable view toward oneself, or toward an entity with whom one stands in the relationship of belonging. In some cases, it appears to involve a type of valuing of oneself or

---

[13] *Ibid.*, 2.1.2.5, 2.1.5.2.1−8, 2.1.5.9.7−11, 2.1.6.2.4−6, 2.1.8.1−5, 2.1.9.1.5−6, and 2.1.9.12.
[14] Taylor, 67.
[15] Hume, *Treatise*, 2.1.5.8.13−14.
[16] Hume, *Treatise*, 2.1.5.4.

another. In others, it seems to have wider implications, like believing that one's self-worth, or another's self-worth, has been validated or increased.

Naturally, since Hume conceives of pride and humility as an antithetical pair, he extends these claims (about the causes of humility and the state of humility itself) to humility, contending that the causes of humility necessarily feel unpleasant, and that humility itself necessarily feels unpleasant, or painful.[17] And as it was in pride's case, both of these claims are false for shame, too. In what follows, we shall see why.

But, these problems aside, Hume's discussion highlights the self-driven nature of emotional pride. It draws our attention to how pride is based on an individual's values, desires, and beliefs. As I noted in chapter 2, Hume employs the word 'asham'd' at least three times and 'shame' at least once. His first use appears in the context of describing how the beauty (or general fitness) of one's own body tends to boost one's self-esteem, while its deformity tends to decrease self-esteem. He addresses a potential exception to this general rule:

> Now as health and sickness vary incessantly to all men, and there is none, who is *solely* or *certainly* fix'd in either, these accidental blessings and calamities are in a manner separated from us, and are never consider'd as connected with our being and existence. And that this account is just appears hence, that wherever a malady of any kind is so rooted in our constitution, that we no longer entertain any hopes of recovery, from that moment it becomes an object of humility; as is evident in old men, whom nothing mortifies more than the consideration of their age and infirmities. They endeavor, as long as possible, to conceal their blindness and deafness, their rheums and gouts; nor do they ever confess them without reluctance and uneasiness. And tho' young men are not asham'd of every head-ach or cold they fall into, yet no topic is so proper to mortify human pride, and make us entertain a mean opinion of our nature, than this, that we are every moment of our lives subject to such infirmities. This sufficiently proves that bodily pain and sickness are in themselves proper causes of humility; tho' the custom of estimating every thing by comparison more than by its intrinsic worth and value, makes us overlook these calamities, which we find to be incident to every one, and causes us to form an idea of our merit and character independent of them.[18]

---

[17] *Ibid.*, 2.1.5.8.13−14 and 2.1.5.9.
[18] *Ibid.*, 2.1.8.8.8−25.

I draw your attention to the fact that the evaluations described in this passage are self-prompted self-evaluations. Unlike the passage in which he describes a person's being mortified by her failed attempt at humor,[19] in this passage, he describes the evaluative responses of individuals who are *not* reacting to others' negative responses toward something that they have done. The individuals described here are reacting to what they see as their own declining health. Their response is to avoid thinking about it, or to pretend that it is not occurring. When they do acknowledge it, Hume observes, it distresses them. This is not to deny that people often fear how others will respond to them, should they disclose some sort of weakness to others. But it is to emphasize that the evaluative response in this case is driven by the view that the person takes of herself.

Hume's second use of 'asham'd' also involves a self-prompted self-evaluation. It concerns the negative reaction a person often has upon realizing that she has falsely compared herself to someone whose merits far outstrip hers:

> There are instances, indeed, wherein men show a vanity in resembling a great man in his countenance, shape, air, or other minute circumstances, that contribute not in any degree to his reputation; but it must be confess'd, that this extends not very far, nor is of any considerable moment in these affections. For this I assign the following reason. We can never have a vanity of resembling in trifles any person, unless he be possess'd of very shining qualities, which give us a respect and veneration for him. These qualities, then, are, properly speaking, the causes of our vanity, by means of their relation to ourselves. Now after what manner are they related to us? They are parts of the persons we value, and consequently connected with these trifles; which are also suppos'd to be parts of him. These trifles are connected with the resembling qualities in us; and these qualities in us, being parts, are connected with the whole; and by that means form a chain of several links betwixt ourselves and the shining qualities of the person we resemble. But besides that this multitude of relations must weaken the connexion; 'tis evident the mind, in passing from the shining qualities to the trivial ones, must by that contrast the better perceive the minuteness of the latter, and be in some measure asham'd of the comparison

---

[19] Hume, *Treatise*, 2.1.7.7.4−6.

and resemblance.[20]

Here, too, Hume offers an example in which the individual's affective response is not prompted by an uncomfortable social exchange or situation. It comes in response to her recognizing that she comes nowhere near close to measuring up against some individual whom she respects and admires. The fact that she, albeit even temporarily, entertained that thought (that she had the sterling qualities of this individual) mortifies her—for staring her in the face is the fact that she is nowhere close to being the kind of person she wishes to be.

I read both of these passages as signaling dissatisfaction on an emoter's part, with who she is, compared to who she would like to be (or who she wishes she were). This would be consistent with what Hume states earlier in Part 1, when he says:

> I observe, by *pride* I understand that agreeable impression, which arises in the mind when the view either of our virtue, beauty, riches or power makes us satisfy'd with ourselves: And that by *humility* I mean the opposite impression.[21]

In a later passage, Hume associates satisfaction with one's sense of power:

> …[S]atisfaction encreases, when any good approaches in such a manner that it is in own's *own* power to take or leave it, and there neither is any physical impediment, nor any very strong motive to hinder our enjoyment….
>
> But this accounts not sufficiently for the satisfaction, which attends riches. A miser receives delight from his money; that is, from the *power* it affords him of procuring all the pleasures and conveniences of life, tho' he knows he has enjoy'd his riches for forty years without ever employing them; and consequently cannot conclude by any species of reasoning, that the real existence of these pleasures is nearer, than if he were entirely depriv'd of all his possessions. But tho' he cannot form any such conclusion in a way of reasoning concerning the nearer approach of the pleasure, 'tis certain he *imagines* it to approach nearer, whenever all external obstacles are remov'd, along with the more powerful motives of interest and danger, which oppose it….[22]

It is in the context of discussing satisfaction and power that Hume uses the word 'shame.'

---

[20] Hume, *Treatise*, 2.1.9.3.5−18.
[21] *Ibid.*, 2.1.7.8.6−9.
[22] *Ibid.*, 2.1.10.8−9.

Referring to the "vanity of power" and "shame of slavery," Hume points out that the value (or

disvalue) that we place on things is a product of how much authority one believes she has,

relative to others. He claims:

> For the same reason, that riches cause pleasure and pride, and poverty excites uneasiness and humility, power must produce the former emotions, and slavery the latter. Power or an authority over others makes us capable of satisfying all our desires; as slavery, by subjecting us to the will of others, exposes us to a thousand wants and mortifications.
> 'Tis here worth observing, that vanity of power, or shame of slavery, are very much augmented by the consideration of the persons, over whom we exercise our authority, or who exercise it over us. For supposing it possible to frame statues of such an admirable mechanism, that they cou'd move and act in obedience to the will; 'tis evident the possession of them wou'd give pleasure and pride, but not to such a degree, as the same authority, when exerted over sensible and rational creatures, whose condition, being compar'd to our own, makes it seem more agreeable and honourable. Comparison is in every case a sure method of augmenting our esteem of any thing.[23]

We might interpret the dissatisfaction of the person who feels ashamed of her declining

health as stemming from her awareness that she may no longer be the person she was (and

wishes she were). The person who feels ashamed of having falsely compared herself to another is

dissatisfied insofar as she realizes that she is not the person she wants to be. And what seems true

of both of these individuals is that they feel some kind of helplessness in the face of their

respective judgments.

We shall return to this discussion later in the chapter, once I have set in place a basic

sketch of emotional shame. (At that time, we shall bring into our discussion Hume's third use of

'asham'd.')

Shame and Entity-Assessment

A common theme in the literature on shame is exposure. Many theories cast shame as *the*

---

[23] Hume, *Treatise*, 2.1.10.10

emotion of exposure, suggesting that emotional shame involves judging that one has been exposed (or is in threat of being exposed) to others in some inappropriate, degrading, or demeaning way. Bernard Williams writes:

> The basic experience connected with shame is that of being seen, inappropriately, by the wrong people, in the wrong condition. It is straightforwardly connected with nakedness, particularly in sexual connections. …The reaction is to cover oneself or to hide, and people naturally take steps to avoid the situations that call for it.[24]

Taylor's analysis of shame also draws on the notion of an audience; however, on her view, the audience in question is oneself. Thus, the focus in shame is not on how one has, or might have, been exposed in some negative light to another or others; rather, it is on how one appears to oneself. She writes:

> [O]n the occasion of an occurrence of shame the person believes that she is defective and degraded. This is her identificatory belief [that is, the belief that identifies the person's emotional state to be shame, instead of some other emotion]. She sees herself in these terms because she is presented with a contrast, where the contrast is between her unselfconscious state, what she thought or hoped or unthinkingly assumed she was, or was doing, and what she has now under the observer-description turned out to be. This comes as a revelation to her. But it need be a revelation only given her initial unselfconsciousness. She may not be making a new discovery about herself, it may just be a reminder. She reaches this judgment by means of her beliefs that what she is doing may be seen under some description (where the description may just be 'object of observation') and that she ought not to be so seen, it is a false position in which she finds herself.[25]

So, for Taylor, the notion of the audience serves only to establish that shame involves an emoter's metaphorically standing outside of herself and evaluating herself against her norm of expectations. I agree with Taylor that the judgements involved in shame are made from the emoter's point of view, against the backdrop of the emoter's own desires, values, beliefs, etc. Where I disagree with Taylor is that I do not think that all cases of shame involve a negative,

---

[24] Bernard Williams, *Shame and Necessity* (1993; repr., Berkeley: University of California Press: 2008): 80.
[25] Taylor, 66.

self-evaluative judgment that one has been degraded.

In chapter 2, I indicated that one of the main points on which I disagree with Gabriele Taylor's views (and others' views) on pride concerns whether pride necessarily involves a positive self-assessment. There, I argued against Taylor, arguing that pride does *not* necessarily involve one's judging that her own status (or worth) has been elevated. Using the example of my being proud of my childhood best friend, Sharon, who lost 167 pounds a few years ago, I argued that the positive evaluation involved does not pertain to my worth; rather, it pertains to Sharon and her worth. I see her worth as enhanced in view of her having made very difficult nutritional and lifestyle changes in order to improve the quality of her life (and likely prolong it).

With respect to shame, I think that we can be ashamed and, at the same time, fail to assess ourselves negatively. Before I argue for the strong claim, let us first see how shame can (also) involve other-directed assessments. Consider someone who, in response to discovering that some of her relatives owned slaves, feels ashamed. For the sake of argument, I acknowledge that the emoter's shame could involve a negative self-assessment: she might be ashamed of her lineage, believing that her relatives' having owned slaves tarnishes her, or negatively impacts her self-image, since she descends from their bloodline. Hume comments on this phenomenon in the third passage in which he employs the word 'asham'd':

> As we are proud of riches in ourselves, so to satisfy our vanity we desire that every one, who has any connexion with us, shou'd likewise be possest of them and are asham'd of any one, that is mean or poor, among our friends and relations. For this reason we remove the poor as far from us as possible; and as we cannot prevent poverty in some distant collaterals, and our forefathers are taken to be our nearest relations; upon this account every one affects to be of a good family, and to be descended from a long succession of rich and honourable ancestors.[26]

But her shame could involve a non-self-directed entity-assessment. For her being

59

ashamed of her ancestors for having owned slaves might consist of her judging that their having

owned slaves taints *them*, since (in her view) it reflects their having had low moral standards,

which is something that she had not envisioned *her* ancestors' having had.

I suppose that one might reject this sort of example, claiming that this emoter does not

share the required 'close' relationship with these relatives in order to be properly ashamed of

them. As a result, one might think that, at best, all we mean when we say that this emoter is

ashamed of her relatives (for having been slave owners) is that she disapproves of their having

been slave owners. For, as the objection might go, one cannot be disappointed in persons with

whom she has no relation other than shared DNA, given that she has no real basis for expecting

them to be certain types of individuals, or act in certain types of ways. I do not happen to believe

that this is so, but I shall offer another example, one in which the emoter bears a closer

relationship to the individual in question.

Take an emoter who is ashamed of her older sibling, Julia, who, despite being in her late-

20s, having a good job, a nice condominium, and laundry facilities of her own, has their mother

launder and press her clothing for her. As the emoter views it, Julia should either do her own

laundry, or she should take it to the cleaners and pay them to do it for her. Having their mother

do her laundry is inappropriate, regardless of whether Julia asked their mother to do her laundry,

or the mother offered to do the laundry.

The emoter's being ashamed of her sister, Julia, indicates that she views Julia

negatively—not herself. Imagine that she consistently scolds her sister for this behavior and even

avoids getting together with her because she of it. These reactions are not consistent with the

emoter's believing that she is in some way vulnerable; rather, they reflect the degree of disgust

---

[26] Hume, *Treatise*, 2.1.9.10.

she feels toward her sister. All of this points to the fact that her being ashamed of her sister reflects a negative judgment toward her sister. It does not suggest that the emoter sees herself dishonored, or in some way tainted, by her sister's behavior.

Perhaps one might respond by further insisting that I have not yet proposed a case of shame, arguing (this time) that the emoter in this case would be better understood as regretting that her sister treats her mother this way and wishing that her sister would cease doing so. Taylor offers a version of this objection when she states:

> To speak of someone as feeling ashamed is not to be very specific about his state. In particular, feeling ashamed may or may not be feeling shame. It is quite possible for a person to claim sincerely that he is feeling ashamed of having said or done something where this means no more than that he regrets having done that thing. 'I am ashamed of it' may function as an expression of regret or remorse which does not involve any beliefs on the agent's part concerning his own standing. Feeling shame, on the other hand, does seem to involve such a belief and so to be in this respect analogous to pride.[27]

But Taylor only begs the question—namely, *does* shame necessitate one's judging herself to have been degraded in some way?

What makes the cases above those of shame and pride—and not some other kind of evaluative state, like (mere) disapproval or approval—is that they are cases in which an emoter makes a special kind of entity-evaluation. They are cases in which an emoter is evaluating not just any entity: she is evaluating an entity with whom/which she bears a special kind of relationship. It may be herself, a sister, a best friend, a colleague, a countryperson, or even her country. But in all cases, it is an entity that bears some type of valuable relationship to her (in her eyes). And it is in virtue of this relationship, that she takes an interest in what happens to the entity in question. So, to say that our emoter is ashamed of her sister, or that I am proud of my best friend, Sharon, is to go beyond expressing that an emoter deems a particular entity to have

been downgraded or upgraded in some regard: it is to indicate that an emoter takes a special concern in the entity. It is to indicate that the emoter takes a special sort of interest in who that entity is, the challenges and opportunities that the entity faces, the failures or accomplishments of the entity, etc. For it indicates that the emoter cares enough to have even formed an entity-view of that person. Whereas the emoter who is ashamed of her sister is pained by her sister's behavior, I am delighted by Sharon's success.

There is a lot of debate in the literature over whether shame itself consists of judging that an entity is less worthy or due less respect (than it would, were the occasion for shame to not have occurred). My inclination is that shame necessitates neither judgment. I shall not formally weigh in on this particular debate, as I think in order to properly weigh in, we would need to analyze the concepts of self-esteem and self-respect; and that is a project that is outside of the purview of the present project. But I do think that there is reason to question whether these kinds of judgment are truly at the heart of the judgment that constitutes shame. And in what follows, I will suggest that some cases of shame do not seem to involve one's judging that some entity (oneself or another) has suffered (or is in danger of suffering from) a decrease in value or merit. Rather, what I propose all cases of emotional shame indicate is a sense of vulnerability, as well as helplessness, on the part of the emoter to protect her self-view, or the view that she takes of another, from something that negatively conflicts with it.

Before we attend to this matter, we shall set in place a basic outline of some of the other conceptual components of shame.

The Objects of Shame

---

[27] Taylor, 53.

Put broadly, in cases in which *X* is ashamed of *Y*, the emoter's shame is prompted by her judging that *Y* itself is somehow importantly lacking or flawed, or that *Y* reflects some kind of important shortcoming or flaw in herself or some entity to whom she bears a meaningful relationship. What this means is that the object of her shame, *Y*, could be an entity (herself, another person, an organization, etc.) or it could be a state of affairs. Regardless, it must be something to whom/which she bears a special type of 'close' relationship—namely, the relation of 'belonging,' which Taylor proposes.

As noted above, the relation of 'belonging' captures a range of different ways in which one can stand in relation to another entity or state of affairs. I shall repeat them here, offering examples for each. Where possible, I have tried to tailor the examples to shame. An entity or state of affairs, *Y*, can 'belong' to an emoter, *X*, in virtue of:

1. *Y*'s standing in a sharing-relation to *X*, whereby *X* and *Y* are members of the same circle of friends, family, profession, country, etc. (*e.g.*, a best friend, cousin, colleague, or countryperson);

2. *Y*'s being possessed by *X* (*e.g.*, a disproportionately large head, an inability to move in step with a beat, a reputation as being bigoted, an arrest record for drunk driving, or having a family history of mental illness); and

3. *Y*'s being owned by *X* (*e.g.*, a garish home, a poor-quality violin, or threadbare clothing);

4. *Y*'s being *X*'s creation, or something for which *X* is at least partially responsible for creating or bringing about (*e.g.*, a lopsided ceramic vase, a child born with a spina bifida, an overly ambitious project timeline, or a failed coup); and

5. *Y*'s possessing an attribute or property for which the emoter believes that she is at

least partially responsible (*e.g.*, a child's hatred of reading, a park's having accessible equipment for children with disabilities, or a protégé's inflated ego).[28]

The relation of 'belonging' accounts for the fact that one cannot be ashamed of someone or something, regardless of the relationship she bears to it. In the absence of a sufficiently 'close' relationship to the entity or state of affairs in question, one could not legitimately claim to be ashamed of it. For example, as much as a complete stranger who lives in Sub-Saharan Africa might disapprove of my poor eating habits (were she to learn of them), she could never legitimately claim to be ashamed of them, given that she cannot claim I 'belong' to her in any of the aforementioned ways. This is not a normative point; it is a conceptual point. *I* can be shamed about my eating habits, as they are *my* eating habits. So, too, could my parents. For instance, they could be ashamed of my poor eating habits on the basis of holding themselves partly responsible for my eating habits' being so poor. However, holding themselves in some way responsible is not the only way that they could claim to be ashamed of my eating habits. They could be ashamed of them in one of the other forms of 'belonging' outlined above. Put another way, they can be ashamed of my poor eating habits and fail to judge themselves to be in some way responsible for them.

At first glance, this might seem counterintuitive: *i.e.*, it might seem that shame must entail a judgment about responsibility (or blameworthiness) on the emoter's part. For example, if someone is ashamed of having been sexually assaulted, we might think her shame necessitates her in some way blaming herself for the sexual assault. And, as a result, we might think that in order to remove her shame, all we need to do is convince her that there was nothing that she could have done to have prevented the abuse. But this would most likely be mistaken. I am not

---

[28] Taylor, 27−35. The examples are mine.

denying that some victims of abuse who feel ashamed might do so in virtue of holding themselves in some way responsible. I *am* denying that all cases of abuse entail the victim's believing so.[29] In other words, I am claiming that someone who is ashamed of having been sexually abused as a child could have gone over all of the possible scenarios for what she could have done differently to avoid the abuse, and come to the conclusion that there was nothing that she could have done to have avoided it. And, despite this, she could still *legitimately* feel ashamed. The relation of 'belonging' helps to explain why, as it explains that an emoter can be ashamed of anything to which she sees herself importantly connected. In an abuse victim's case, that might mean her seeing the abuse as something that she possesses—*i.e.*, in the sense of its being part of her, or weighing on her like an albatross.

Now that we have a general sketch in place of the constraints on the objects of shame, let us shift our attention to the kinds of judgments that are involved in shame.

Inconsistency, Vulnerability, and Shame

Put broadly, emotional shame seems to involve one's judging that something bears negatively on an important aspect of her self-view or of her view of another entity. I am using the notion of an entity-view broadly, to include traits of character, attributes, commitments,

---

[29] My suspicion is that people's tendency to associate shame and blame stems from their conflating emotional shame with the public practice of shaming, which is sometimes used as a means for punishing people for their misdeeds. But, as my account contends, emotional shame is internally driven by the view that one takes of herself or by that she takes of another. Even though we are all, more or less, concerned with how we are viewed by others, I think that it would be a mistake to think that emotional shame directly arises out of an emoter's concern that others will chastise or brand her with a proverbial 'scarlet letter,' in an attempt to expose some failure or weakness on her part. We might associate experiencing emotional shame with an emoter's tendency to withdraw from social contact. But this does not prove that shame-emoters who withdraw from society specifically do so because they fear being exposed to others in a negative light. A better explanation seems to be that an emoter's withdrawing from social contact is a side effect of shame's tendency to draw her attention inward. I associate extreme cases of self-directed emotional shame with an emoter's feeling overwhelmed, helpless, anxious, depressed, or a combination thereof.

desires, etc.[30] It also includes an emoter's expectations of the entity in question, as well as her expectations *for* the entity in question. These expectations might pertain to the entity's behavior, education, career, relationships, financial status, and social standing, reputation, and so forth. So, for instance, shame might arise when one believes that her expectations have not been met, or, for some reason, cannot be met. For example, an emotional outburst at work might prompt one to believe that she will be fired from her job, where being fired from a job is something that she never expected could (let alone, would) happen to her.

Or consider someone who is ashamed of having been sexually abused as a child. She might believe that having been abused constrains the kind of expectations that she can reasonably have for her future. For instance, she might believe that the abuse has deprived her of abilities or accomplishments that she would have had, were she not to have been abused. Perhaps she believes that she will never be able to form meaningful intimate relationships with others, given her inability to trust others (which she believes stems from the abuse). Moreover, she might believe that others will reject her on the basis of her having been abused.

We shall have to say more about how one goes from making these judgments to feeling ashamed.[31] Before we proceed, however, it is important that we recognize that not all cases in which one believes that an inconsistency exists between some state of affairs and her entity-view

---

And I propose that she withdraws from social contact not because she fears others' reactions or judgments, but because she loses sight of them, her thoughts being almost obsessively self-focused.

[30] Please note: I am not using these terms in any technical sense. I shall not be weighing in on the ongoing debate concerning whether shame is best understood in terms of self-worth, self-esteem, or some combination thereof—nor shall I be weighing in on the subsequent question of what, exactly, shame implies about one's self-worth or self-esteem (*e.g.*, that it is vulnerable, has been diminished, or has been lost). Those interested in that debate might consult Taylor, 77−81, or John Deigh, "Shame and Self-Esteem: A Critique," *Ethics* 93, no. 2 (January 1983): 225−45.

[31] For, as described, these cases are consistent with an emoter's being depressed or disappointed.

will prompt shame. Shame involves taking a particular kind of negative view toward the inconsistency.

Some inconsistencies may be perceived in a favorable light. An emoter might welcome an inconsistency, were she to believe that it necessitates a favorable revision of her entity-view. Take a 23-year-old who is midway through her third year of teaching third grade at an elementary school. Used to being closely monitored by more experienced teachers, she realizes that she has yet to receive any critical feedback about her lesson plans or have any her classes observed by a more senior teacher. When told that these were not oversights, she is initially taken aback, given that her school's treating her like an experienced teacher does not jibe with her conceiving of herself as a new teacher who needs quite a bit of support. But ultimately, she trusts her school's judgment; and in response, she modifies how she sees herself. In addition, not all inconsistencies that one perceives negatively will lead to a person's feeling ashamed. For instance, one might not feel ashamed of having received a speeding ticket, even though she acknowledges that she can no longer pride herself on having never received any tickets.

A final clarification: the circumstances that prompt the inconsistency need not feel some particular way, or be associated with some particular kind of feeling. Hume suggests that whenever shame arises, it arises (in part) from a negative feeling, like pain. But experience tells us that sometimes, we are ashamed of the pleasure that we have taken in, or felt in response to, some state of affairs. People who are dieting speak of being ashamed of the pleasure they feel when eating fatty foods. Veterans speak of being ashamed of the pleasure they felt while inflicting harm on civilians and fellow soldiers. Moreover, sometimes it is the very fact that one felt neither pleased about nor upset about a state of affairs that serves as the object of one's shame.

Therefore, shame seems to depend on one's judging that the inconsistency recommends a change to her entity-view (or even a constraint on her entity-view) that would be, in some significant sense, degrading or debasing to the entity in question. And, crucially, instead of accepting this suggestion and adopting a downwardly-revised entity-view, the emoter who feels ashamed resists the change. This emoter feels what I have been describing as dissatisfaction. I shall now say more about what I mean by this.

Dissatisfaction and Helplessness

In the context of discussing some of the passages in which Hume refers to shame, I suggested that we might associate feeling ashamed with feeling dissatisfied in a particular way. In this section, I shall seek to clarify what I mean by this. Generally-speaking, I propose that we might think of shame as consisting of a particular type of dissatisfaction on the part of the emoter with what some state of affairs implies about some entity-view, and what she wishes that entity-view to be. Returning to the case of our emoter who feels ashamed for having been sexually abused as a child, we might envision her as as comparing two types of self-views: one that excludes the abuse, and the other that includes it. The function of the comparison is that it brings to light what she believes could have been the case, were she to have never been abused; or even what she believes could be the case, if only she were able to rid herself of the psychological scars from it. The details of the comparison aside, the emoter arrives at a judgment that she has lost something valuable as a result of the abuse. And that she feels ashamed—and not just saddened—I argue, indicates that she is dissatisfied with the loss that she believes that she has incurred. In short, it suggests that there is something about this 'belonging' that she wishes she did not have, but that she believes she is powerless to change.

68

The purpose of this example is to illustrate how dissatisfaction is involved in shame, as well as to suggest that shame seems to involve an emoter's desiring to detach herself from some aspect of the cause of her shame. By offering this example, I am not suggesting that every case of shame arises from a comparison of entity-views, nor I am suggesting that shame necessarily involves an emoter's believing that she has suffered a loss that implies a downgrading of an entity's worth or status. While the case above involves an emoter's believing that her worth has been negatively impacted (in the sense that she believes that she has lost something valuable as a result of having been sexually assaulted), I am not committed to the view that all cases of shame involve judgment pertaining to an entity's value or worth. At the very least, what we know of emoters who feel ashamed is that they find some set of circumstances unsatisfactory. But the degree to which that upsets them need not rise to extreme levels. For instance, I take it that an emoter who is ashamed of having received a speeding ticket might not suffer any palpable loss of self-esteem or self-worth due to it. That she feels ashamed of having received the ticket suggests that she is uneasy with how the speeding ticket conflicts with her self-view (or some aspect thereof); moreover, it suggests frustration on her part, given that as hard as she might try, she necessarily cannot rid herself of this 'possession' (*i.e.*, the fact that she received a ticket).

At this point, we have a basic sketch of shame in place. According to this sketch, one who feels ashamed is dissatisfied with some state of affairs and how it impinges on (or conflicts with) one or more aspects of her self-view, or of the view she takes of some entity with whom she stands in the relation of 'belonging.' She feels helpless in the face of the conflict, as she does not believe that she can remove the source of conflict. Yet, she wishes she could remove it because she believes that it tarnishes the entity-view in question. And given the value that she places on the subject of that entity-view (whether herself or another), she desires that it not be

69

tarnished.

In the next chapter, we shall look at the similarities between pride and shame, as well as draw attention to some of the interesting dissimilarities between the two.

Chapter 4: Pride Revisited, and Some Further Remarks on Pride and on Shame

Introduction

In chapter 2, as a means of providing a framework for our analysis of pride and shame, I provided a sketch of some of the main elements of Hume's causal analysis of pride and humility (shame). I selected Hume's account of pride and humility Hume's in Book 2 of the *Treatise* because of the richness of its analysis of these emotions, compared to the analyses offered by his early modern contemporaries. For even though Hume's account does not explicitly explore emotional pride and shame (but, instead, seeks to analyze the positive and negative forms of self-evaluation) a great deal of what Hume observes in his account applies to emotional pride and shame.

Then, I narrowed our focus to pride and introduced Taylor's contemporary Humean account of pride. In part, my purpose in doing so was to highlight some of the ways in which Taylor has improved Hume's account: *e.g.*, by discarding Hume's claim that one necessarily experiences pleasure in the cause of her pride in favor of the claim that pride necessarily involves one's valuing the object-cause of it, and by proposing the relation of 'belonging' as a way to understand Hume's vague notion of the 'close' relationship that must exist between an emoter and the object of her pride. But I also wanted to identify some of issues on which I disagree with Taylor: chiefly, I wanted to raise the issue of whether pride necessarily is an emotion of self-assessment.

I did not proceed in chapter 2 to conduct my own analysis of pride. Instead, I chose to end the chapter and, in chapter 3, turn our attention to shame. There, making use of some of the elements about that I had introduced in chapter 2, I began the process of analyzing shame.

In this chapter, which is the final chapter of this dissertation, I shall begin by returning to pride. Using elements from my discussion of shame in chapter 3, I shall identify some of the ways in which pride and shame are similar, as well as some of those in which they differ. From there, I will return, in a manner of speaking, to a topic that I raised in chapter 1—the topic of propositional accounts of the emotions, and the extent to which they can shed light on the natures of pride and of shame.

In chapter 1, I considered Gordon's propositional account of the emotions and provided a general endorsement of the ways in which his account departs from traditional models of emotion taxonomy. If we focus specifically on how these changes would impact our understanding of pride and shame, I think that there is benefit in replacing the traditional positive/negative distinction with a wish-satisfaction/wish-frustration distinction. The latter clarifies why it is that when one is proud, she feels satisfied: she feels satisfied because a wish of hers has been fulfilled. It clarifies, too, why when one is ashamed, she feels dissatisfied: her dissatisfaction arises from the fact that a wish of hers has been frustrated.

As for Gordon's proposal that we replace the forward-looking/backward-looking distinction with a uncertainty/certainty distinction (or fails to know that p/knows that p), in chapter 1, I indicated that I am less convinced.[1] Gordon *is* correct in thinking that the forward-looking/backward-looking distinction is problematic and that its replacement should focus on the beliefs of the emoter. But, for reasons I discussed, I do not think that a knowledge criterion is the proper replacement. If we narrow our focus to pride and shame, while some cases of pride involve one's believing that some event (that fulfills her wish) has occurred, others involve one's

---

[1] The forward-looking/backward-looking distinction differentiates between (1) emotions that are directed toward events that have not yet occurred and (2) emotions that are directed toward events that have occurred.

believing that it is likely that some event (that shall fulfill her wish) will occur. And while some cases of shame involve one's believing that some event (that frustrates her wish) has occurred, others involve one's believing that it is likely that some event (that frustrates her wish) will occur. In other words, some cases of pride and shame are anticipatory. To be clear, I am not proposing that we redraw the forward-looking/backward-looking distinction in view of these observations about pride and shame. I would have to consider the nature of other emotions before I committed myself one way or the other.

My reason for revisiting Gordon's account here is because in this chapter, I shall examine another propositional account. This time, however, the propositional account is of pride. It is the account that Donald Davidson develops in "Hume's Cognitive Theory of Pride."[2] As we shall see, while the account itself fails to capture the content of the real reasons for why people feel proud, it captures the fact that when we experience pride, that pride is relativized to an aspect of ourselves or an entity to which we stand in the relation of 'belonging.' Put another way, to experience emotional pride is to be proud for a reason. And while Davidson does not consider shame, this follows for shame, too.

We shall begin, then, by examining the components of pride and shame.

That the Objects of Pride and Shame are Governed by 'Belonging'

In chapter 2, I presented Hume's analysis of the types of things that cause people to feel proud or ashamed, and I noted that it is insightful in two ways. First, it recognizes that the causes of our pride and shame must bear a special kind of relation to us—namely, a close one.

---

[2] Donald Davidson, "Hume's Cognitive Theory of Pride," in *Essays on Actions and Events*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001): 279−84.

Secondly, it captures the breadth of causes of our pride and shame. Besides pointing out that people are proud or ashamed of aspects related to themselves, their families, their friends, etc., his analysis observes that the things that make us proud or ashamed of the aforementioned are wide-ranging, including character-traits, physical features, pursuits, possessions, achievements/failures, status, etc. Moreover, Hume notices that people are sometimes proud or ashamed of their countries of origin, pointing out that amongst those things which cause our feeling one way or the other include the country's terrain, the fertility of its soil, the quality of goods produced therein, and matters pertaining to the language of one's homeland.[3] I also discussed Taylor's efforts to provide a clearer understanding of the kind of 'close' relationship that an emoter must bear to the object-cause of her pride or shame. And in chapter 3, when discussing the objects of shame, I indicated that I thought that Hume's account of the objects of pride and shame, as amended by Taylor—*i.e.*, whereby the requisite 'close' relationship is that of 'belonging'—provides a useful basis for characterizing the objects of both pride and shame. On that account *Y*, can 'belong' to an emoter, *X*, in virtue of:

1. *Y*'s standing in a sharing-relation to *X*, whereby *X* and *Y* are members of the same circle of friends, family, profession, country, etc.;

2. *Y*'s being possessed by *X*;

3. *Y*'s being owned by *X*;

4. *Y*'s being *X*'s creation, or something for which *X* is at least partially responsible for creating or bringing about; and

5. *Y*'s possessing an attribute or property for which the emoter believes that she is at

---

[3] Hume, *Treatise*, 2.1.9.6−10.

least partially responsible. [4]

I acknowledge that opinions may differ as to whether it is true that any characteristic, ability, possession, etc., that 'belongs' to a particular entity can serve as a *reasonable* object of pride or shame. Especially in cases in which one is proud of some aspect of another entity, we might wonder whether there are limits on the kinds of considerations that can serve as the proper objects of one's pride or shame. However, my concern in this dissertation is not with how we ought to judge the reasonableness of one's being proud or ashamed of oneself, another entity, or some particular aspect of oneself or another entity. Instead, I am concerned with providing an account of the necessary constraints on the possible *intelligible* causes of pride and shame; and what I am maintaining is that any aspect of oneself or any entity other than oneself that fails to stand in the relation of 'belonging' to the emoter necessarily cannot serve as an object of pride or shame.[5]

The relation of 'belonging' sheds light on the nature of the 'close' relationship that an emoter must bear to the object-cause of her pride or shame. It does not shed light on what, exactly, it is about the object-cause of one's pride or shame that leads one to experience the emotion in question. This, then, shall be the focus of the next section.

The Dependence of Pride and Shame on an Emoter's Judgments, Entity-Views, and Attitudes

In chapter 2, after describing that Hume associates pride with one's finding the cause of her pride to be pleasant, and shame with one's finding that cause to be unpleasant, I presented

---

[4] Taylor, 27–35.

[5] I have been operating under the assumption that it follows that if one cannot be proud or ashamed of an aspect of oneself to which one fails to stand in the relation of 'belonging,' then one cannot be proud or ashamed or an aspect of another entity unless that aspect stands in the relation of 'belonging' to the entity in question. I suppose, however, that to be perfectly clear, I should add that one's being proud or ashamed of some aspect of an entity other than herself necessitates that the aspect in question stands in the relation of 'belonging' to the entity in question.

Taylor's reasons for believing that pride and shame are better understood as involving judgments about the value of the cause in question.[6] Then, in agreement with Taylor, I proposed that in cases in which one is proud of an aspect of oneself, one's pride involves judging that aspect to be importantly valuable to oneself.

Where I disagreed with Taylor is that I argued that we should not reduce cases in which one is proud of another entity (or some aspect thereof) to which one stands in the relation of 'belonging' to cases in which one is proud of the relationship that one bears to that entity. I grant that there may be cases in which one is proud of the relationship (or some aspect thereof) that one bears to another entity. In such cases, one's pride involves judging the relationship in question to be importantly of value to oneself. But I contend that there is an additional class of cases in which one is proud of an aspect of another entity (to whom one stands in the relation of 'belonging'). In these instances, one's pride involves judging that aspect to be importantly valuable to the entity in question—not oneself. All of these judgments, I suggested, are made in light of the norm of expectations that one has for oneself or for the entity in question.

In chapter 3, I introduced the broader notion of an entity-view as a means of explaining how one arrives at the judgments one makes concerning whether something is valuable or not for the entity-object (whether that may be oneself or another) of one's pride or shame. I defined an entity-view as including such things as an emoter's beliefs about the character, commitments, abilities, capabilities, etc., of the entity in question, her expectations of the entity in question, and her desires for the entity in question (where these latter two might pertain to matters concerning the entity's pursuits, career path, relationships, financial status, etc.). And with this definition in

---

[6] Taylor is one amongst many scholars who have pointed out the inability for Hume's pleasant/unpleasant feelings distinction to capture the nature of the evaluations involved in pride and shame.

place, I described shame as involving an emoter's judging that some event or set of circumstances impinges on an important aspect of the emoter's entity-view in question in such a way that it calls into question the integrity of that aspect or even the entity-view in question. We can incorporate the notion of an entity-view into our definition of pride by describing pride as involving an emoter's judging that some event or set of circumstances endorses or indicates a surpassing of some important aspect of the emoter's entity-view in question.

What I contend is that pride and shame depend on an emoter's beliefs about how some event or set of circumstances stands in relation to her self-view or whichever entity-view of hers might be in question. The implication is that an emoter cannot be properly proud of *X* unless *she* judges *X* to be an event or set of circumstances that is in accordance with, or represents a surpassing of, some important aspect of the entity-view (of hers) that is in question. Further, an emoter cannot be properly ashamed of *X* unless she judges *X* to be importantly inconsistent with whatever entity-view of hers is in question. In other words, I am arguing that other individuals' judgments or declarations that one *should* feel proud or ashamed of *X* are not sufficient to cause one to feel proud or ashamed of *X*. Unless one agrees that *X* has the requisite kind of important bearing on the entity-view in question (whether oneself or another), one shall not feel proud or ashamed of *X*.

Experience confirms that not all opinions matter to us. In some cases we are amused, and in other offended, when told by someone that we should be proud of our having done something that we deem as being especially trivial, like successfully ironing a shirt without leaving scorch marks on it, or managing to hold down a job for more than two weeks. Why? In cases in which we are amused, we think that the person in question must have very low expectations of herself if she looks at us in awe for having done something so trivial. In cases in which we take offense, it

is on the basis of believing that this person thinks very little of us, given how low her

expectations are of us. Or consider our reactions when told by someone we view as being

morally corrupt that we ought to be ashamed of ourselves for some reason. Do we take this as a

serious reason to carefully examine ourselves and our actions? No, we tend to scoff at the

suggestion.

This is not to say that others cannot influence us. Rather, it is to say that unless another

can get us to consider the matter in virtue of our views, we shall not be swayed. Arnold Isenberg

observes:

> [A] normal person wishes to be esteemed for those attributes which he esteems. The artist
> and the scientist demand applause on their own strict terms. The shallowness of those
> who exult in empty praise is inexpressible, for they have sacrificed every other standard
> and have no longer a conception of what it is good to be honored *for*. Besides, there are
> people who, having proudly rejected the toleration of society on behalf of some notion of
> good, are supported in their intransigence by no one but a few dead authors, who cannot
> make their pleasure or displeasure felt.[7]

Given that pride and shame are so intimately tied to an emoter's assessment of herself

and others, as well as the desires and expectations she has for herself and others, an analysis of

things like the occasions that prompt an emoter's experiencing pride or shame, the frequency

with which she experiences pride or shame, and how her experiences of pride or shame affect her

have the potential to reveal important things about the emoter not only to other people, but also

to the emoter herself. So, at this time, I shall take a quick detour from our discussion of the

components of pride and shame, and consider a few of the suggestions concerning the benefits of

pride and shame in self-analysis and influencing our behavior.

---

[7] Arnold Isenberg, "Natural Pride and Natural Shame," in *Explaining Emotions*, ed. Amélie Oksenberg Rorty
(Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980), 2.

Pride, Shame, and Action

Some in the literature recognize the potentials benefits that can come from pride and shame, given their necessarily involving self-reflection. For instance, reflecting on the occasions of one's experiences of pride can remind us of things that we have achieved, abilities or strengths that we drew on in order to achieve those things, relationships that have special meaning to us, etc. To be sure, feelings of pride do not seem to provide us with a direct motive toward any particular action—in the sense that they do not urge us to pursue a particular action. However, some might provide us with reasons to have confidence in ourselves and our future. The influence on our action might be to expand our self-views, with regard to what we think we are capable of doing and achieving.

Shame, on the other hand, is more complicated. John Wilson notes that the value of shame is supposed to be in its ability to "alert [one] to [one's] errors and defects so that [one] may improve [one's] performance in the future."[8] And Taylor claims that "genuine shame…[is] always constructive in the sense of being a pressure towards maintaining or returning to the equilibrium [of commitments that constitutes one's self]."[9] Yet both caution that directing our attention to our shortcomings, failures, disadvantages, etc., could be debilitating, should it cause us to withdraw into ourselves and obsess about our past, which, of course, we cannot change. At

---

[8] John B. Wilson, "Shame, Guilt, and Moral Education," *Journal of Moral Education* 30, no. 1 (2001): 79.
[9] Taylor, 141. However, he emphasizes that it is an empirical question as to whether or not our experiences of shame succeed in doing this.

the same time, there are those who, despite recognizing that feeling ashamed can produce bad outcomes, argue that the potential good that can shame is worth the risk.[10]

One might expect that shame can directly motivate action, given that shame involves a sense of dissatisfaction on the emoter's part. Consider the following historical example: In 1901, President Teddy Roosevelt invited Booker T. Washington to dine with him at the White House. Roosevelt's inviting a person to color to the White House prompted great public criticism, not only from Roosevelt's political foes, but also his allies, as this was the first time any person of color had been invited to the White House. Roosevelt was well-aware that his inviting Washington would outrage many, but, as is well-documents, he was not the type of person to allow potential or actual controversy to influence his decisions. In view of this, it is somewhat surprising to learn that Roosevelt, albeit momentarily, did consider withholding the invitation, given the controversy and political repercussions that he knew would ensue. In recounting the events that led up to his inviting Washington to the White House, Roosevelt claims that it was the shame he felt in that moment's pause that convinced him to invite Washington. He states, "The very fact that I felt a moment's qualm on inviting him because of his color made me ashamed of myself and made me send the invitation."[11]

If we are to believe Roosevelt, it would appear as if we have a case in which shame directly motivated action. But appearances can be deceiving. For Roosevelt goes on to explain, "I would not lose my self-respect by fearing to have a man like Booker T. Washington to dinner

---

[10] For instance, see Michael L. Morgan, *On Shame*. Thinking in Action, ed. by Simon Critchley and Richard Kearney (New York: Routledge, 2008); and Richard J. Arneson, "Shame, Stigma, and Disgust in the Decent Society" *The Journal of Ethics* 11, no. 1 (March 2007): 31–63.

[11] "Roosevelts: An Intimate History." Episode Two: "In the Arena (1901–1910)." A Production of Florentine Films. Executive Producer: Ken Burns. The Roosevelt Film Project, Inc., 2013. Originally aired on PBS on September 15, 2014.

if it cost me every political friend I have got."[12] What motivated Roosevelt to issue the invitation was not, I submit, the shame that he felt for having momentarily hesitated; rather, it was his desire to avoid losing his self-respect for not inviting Washington that motivated his issuing the invitation. This is not to say that the shame he felt did not play a role in his offering the invitation; rather, it is to make clear that it was not the shame, in and of itself, that led to this action. What made the difference is that his thoughts turned toward the future, and his desire to avoid future shame kicked in. The danger, however, is that if one does not have this kind of response, but, instead, turns inward and dwells on one's past, that could lead to one's downwardly revising one's self-view. And that could be very detrimental, especially if were to severely limit what one thought one was capable of achieving.

The point I wish to emphasize is that pride and shame do not have the power, on their own, to motivate action. Consider the amateur writer who learns that a well-respected literary journal intends to publish one of her short stories. Proud of this accomplishment, upon receiving the issue, she frames the issue's table of contents, and places it beside her computer. Despite the delay between the event that prompted her initial feeling of pride—*i.e.*, her learning that her short story will be published—and the actions in question, we can reasonably expect that the quality of the pride that she feels upon receiving the journal and actually seeing her name in print is just as, if not more, intense. If we think solely about how her actions relate to the second occurrence of pride, it would seem that her actions express her pride, but are not themselves motivated by pride. Perhaps what motivates her to frame the table of contents and place it beside her desk is a desire to communicate to others, or even to remind herself, of this accomplishment.

Let us step back and consider how her actions might relate to her initial experience of

---

[12] *Ibid.*

pride, or the pride that she experienced at t_1. I think a case could be made that her pride at t_1 disposed her in such a way so as to desire to sustain, or even induce future instances of, the feelings of self-esteem, confidence, etc., that she experienced at t_1. While this fails to be a case in which pride directly motivates action, it does suggest a way in which pride may indirectly cause action. So, the takeaway is not that pride and shame play no roles in action. It is that they do not, on their own, serve as direct motivations for action.

All of this said, we must not lose sight of what is required of a person to feel such emotions. Feeling shame requires a certain kind of vulnerability on the emoter's part. Unless one acknowledges the very possibility that one's self-view or view of another is susceptible to downward revision or, minimally, to being questioned in some way, one is incapable of feeling it. But beyond this, shame requires one to accept that one cannot erase, or explain away, the grounds that have prompted one's shame. Pride also involves vulnerability, but in a different sense. In order to experience pride, one must accept that there are circumstances that would count as representing the entity-in-question's meeting or exceeding the expectations in question. In addition, it strikes me that in order to experience pride, one must be able to acknowledge that there are circumstances that would count as an entity-in-question's failing to meet the expectations in question. For unless one believes it is actually possible for the entity to fail, one seemingly has no basis for feeling satisfied that an entity has met or exceeded the standards. In this sense, a person's temperament plays a role in determining the extent to one will feel, let alone whether one is even capable of feeling, pride and shame.

It is interesting to consider the possible role that our experiences of pride and shame (and other emotions) may play in our lives—*e.g.*, how they may influence future feelings of pride and shame, how they may affect how we see ourselves and the world around us, etc. Richard

Wollheim states, "[T]he role of the emotion is to provide…the person…with an *orientation*, or an *attitude to the world*. If belief maps the world, and desire targets it, emotion tints or colors it: it enlivens it or darkens it, as the case may be."[13] Considering these larger questions about how pride and shame figure into shaping the course of our lives is far too complicated a project for this dissertation. But I do find Annette Baier's suggestions intriguing:

> Content and discontent, dismay or amusement, may be direct not just at localized and usually present happenings, but at the emerging shape of one's life, as seen from the current high or low, boggy or firm point. That shape will be the path traced by the sequence of one's successive loves, griefs, ambitions, disappointments, hopes, and despairs, in the context of the paths of one's fellows, past and present. The apparent object of contentment or ironic acceptance can be some situation now, but the deep object is the whole life path, in the context of other paths, life as we have so far found it, and sometimes the deep object will become the apparent object, so that we consciously try to assess how things are going, in a very general sense.[14]

At this point, let us return to our discussion of the components of pride and shame, and consider its role in our understanding the natures of pride and of shame.

The Affective Component of Pride and Shame

The final element that we must set in place if we wish to understand pride and shame is the affective component of each. For pride, it is the attitude of being satisfied, and for shame, the attitude of being dissatisfied. Until now, I have not said much about the importance of the affective component in pride and shame. But, as we shall see, one cannot properly understand pride or shame if one neglects this affective element.

At first glance it might not seem as if these attitudes are strong enough to account for the emotions at-hand. When we think of how people tend to feel or act when they experience pride,

---

[13] Richard Wollheim, *On the Emotions* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999), 15.
[14] Annette C. Baier, "What Emotions are About," *Nôus-Supplement: Philosophical Perspectives (Action Theory and Philosophy of Mind)* 6 (1990): 24.

we often think of feeling elated and displaying behaviors like slightly raising one's chin, puffing up one's chest, confidently making eye contact with others, smiling from ear to ear, adopting an open posture, etc.[15] With shame, we think of feeling sad, dejected, anxious, and despair. And we often associate shame with behaviors like hanging one's head, casting one's gaze downward, adopting a closed-off or shrinking posture, and withdrawing from social interaction. The problem with these descriptions is that characterize only what might think of as being particularly significant, or weighty, experiences of pride and shame. Although it may be true that some cases of pride and shame find expression in these feelings or behaviors, not all do. For this reason, pride and shame cannot be reduced to a particular feeling or set of behavioral responses (or what we might think of as behavioral reflexes).[16]

For those who may remain unconvinced that pride and shame can be experienced without having a particular kind of positive or negative felt quality, respectively, perhaps thinking about particular cases of pride and shame will help. In chapter 3, I offered the example of one's being ashamed of oneself for having received a speeding ticket in order to illustrate that it is the attitudinal response of dissatisfaction that constitutes shame. The point I tried to make there was that the events that might serve as the prompts for our feeling ashamed of ourselves, need to lead us to (drastic) conclusion that we, as a person, have been fully degraded. The point was to show that there need not be a drastic upheaval in one's life just because, as was the case with the speeding ticket, one feel ashamed of oneself for one reason or another. Here, I shall offer an

---

[15] At approximately 4 minutes and 30 sections into her TED Talk on the role that body language impacts our lives, Amy Cuddy describes research that shows that both individuals who were born with sight and those who are congenitally blind tend to exhibit the same behavior upon winning some sort of athletic competition—namely, they slightly raise their chin and stretch their arms above their heads in the shape of a V. This type of behavior, she notes, is known as pride. See Amy Cuddy, "Your Body Language Shapes Who You Are," *TEDGlobal*, June 2012, accessed April 23, 2016, http://www.ted.com/talks/amy_cuddy_your_body_language_shapes_who_you_are
[16] Patricia S. Greenspan, *Emotions and Reasons: An Inquiry into Emotional Justification* (New York: Routledge, 1988): 164.

autobiographical case.

When I somewhere around 7 years old, while on a family trip to see my paternal grandmother in Davenport, Iowa, I stole a sticker from the Hallmark Store. I knew that it was wrong, and I felt guilty at the time. Still, I stole it. To be sure, I continued to feel guilty about having done so. In fact, I remember avoiding the store on subsequent trips to Davenport, fearing that they had somehow discovered my act of theft and would be on the lookout for me. But it was not until later, when I reflected on what I had done, that I felt ashamed of having stolen the sticker. And to this day, I continue to be ashamed of myself for having stolen the sticker. What this shame amounts to is my being importantly dissatisfied by the choice that I made that that time, given what I believe was true of myself (with respect to what I knew to be right and wrong, what were reasonable expectations of behavior for me, etc.) at that time. Perhaps it is true that when I first realized that I was truly ashamed of myself for having stolen the sticker I felt a little queasy in the stomach. I do not remember. If I had, notice, however, that the queasy feeling would have been in response to my dissatisfaction, and not the other way around.

As for pride's not requiring feelings of elation, consider someone who is going through a difficult period in her life. Usually an energetic person who excels at multitasking, lately, she has felt overwhelmed and unmotivated. In an attempt to get out of this funk, she sets a variety of goals for herself, including getting out of bed each morning by 9 o'clock. After having failed to meet this goal for a couple of months, one Tuesday morning, she accomplishes it; and while brushing her teeth that morning, she feels proud of herself.

As described, we have no reason to believe that the emoter in this case is smiling or feeling particularly energized. In fact, I would not be surprised if later on that day, upon reflecting on the pride she felt that morning, she felt ashamed of herself for having done

something that she, under normal circumstances, would have considered trivial. But these later feelings aside, what she experienced while brushing her teeth that morning was, indeed, pride. When she reflected on her having (finally) met that goal, she found importantly satisfying her having accomplished something that, up until that morning, she had been unable to do.

I hope to have now established that when thinking about pride and shame, we ought to be focused on them as affective attitudes of satisfaction and dissatisfaction, respectively. And, to be sure, the intensity, or forcefulness, of the satisfaction or dissatisfaction that one feels can vary. Some of the factors bear on how much satisfaction or dissatisfaction one experiences include the significance that one places on the event or set of circumstances in question, the degree to which one judges that the entity-view in question has been enhanced or compromised, and whether the entity-view in question is her self-view or not. Others include things like whether the cause is something that occurred moments ago or years ago, and whether one's pride or shame was accompanied, enhanced, or constrained by other matters. For instance, imagine the parents of a soldier who was killed in battle while shielding others from fire. We would expect that the satisfaction they might take in knowing that their son died while acting to protect others is clouded by the pain they are experiencing at the loss of their son.

In my mind, the most significant takeaway that comes from recognizing that pride and shame express attitudes of satisfaction and dissatisfaction is that we now have the tools to, once and for all, show why pride and shame are not best understood as emotions of self-assessments—*i.e.*, the view that pride and shame comprise judgments that one's status has been upgraded or downgraded, respectively. To this issue, we shall now turn.

Throughout this dissertation, I have sought to argue that pride and shame are not best understood as necessitating that we view ourselves as having been upgraded or degraded in status. I think that now that we have the affective component of pride and shame in place, we are halfway there to providing our most convincing argument against seeing pride and shame in that way. For I suspect that part of the reason why might be tempted to think of pride and shame as involving these global self-directed conclusions about status is that they associate pride and shame with great upheavals in our feelings. But now that we have established that any feelings that might arise from pride and shame are dependent on the attitudes of satisfaction and dissatisfaction felt, I think that we are halfway there. The piece that remains is to show that the judgments associated with pride and shame are not global in nature—*i.e.*, not directed toward the whole person—but local—*i.e.*, directed toward an aspect of the person. To help us see this matter, we shall make use of Davidson's insights in his Humean account of propositional pride.

Believing that every instance of 'being proud of' reduces to, or is based on, 'being proud that,' Davidson believes that one can use the merits of Hume's discussion of pride to generate an account of "the conditions under which predicates like 'x is proud that he is clever' apply."[17] Using Hume's example of the proud owner of a beautiful house, Davidson sets out to show how the causes of, or grounds for, the homeowner's pride can be expressed as premises of a syllogism whose conclusion expresses the homeowner's approval of his being the owner of a beautiful house. Even though Davidson presents the homeowner's reasons as premises in a valid syllogistic form, he does not regard the propositions that express those reasons as necessitating the judgment that corresponds to the person's self-approval. This is in keeping with his views about the relationship between one's reasons for acting and the judgment that corresponds to

---

[17] Davidson, "Hume's Cognitive Theory of Pride," 278.

one's acting. While in one of his early papers, namely, "Actions, Reasons, and Causes,"[18] he

argues that practical reasoning is deductive in character, he eventually gives up this view. And in

"How is Weakness of the Will Possible?,"[19] Davidson contends that the conclusions of one's

reasoning, while providing one with the strongest reason for acting in some particular way, need

not be what, for the actor, turns out to be the causally strongest reason for acting.

As I noted above, Davidson tailors his account of propositional pride to Hume's example

of someone who is proud of owning a beautiful house. Hume presents this example in the

context of discussing the various causal components of pride and humility. He writes:

> A man, for instance, is vain of a beautiful house, which belongs to him, or which he has himself built and contriv'd. Here the object of the passion is himself, and the cause is the beautiful house: Which cause again is sub-divided into two parts, *viz.* the quality, which operates upon the passion, and the subject, in which the quality inheres. The quality is the beauty, and the subject is the house, consider'd as his property or contrivance. Both these parts are essential, nor is the distinction vain and chimerical. Beauty, consider'd merely as such, unless plac'd upon something related to us, never produces any pride or vanity; and the strongest relation alone, without beauty, or something else in its place, has as little influence on that passion. Since, therefore, these two particulars are easily separated, and there is a necessity for their conjunction, in order to produce the passion, we ought to consider them as component parts of the cause; and infix in our minds an exact idea of this distinction.[20]

A few pages later, after introducing his (infamous) doctrine of the double relation of ideas and

impressions, Hume returns to the example, stating:

> [W]e find, that a beautiful house, belonging to ourselves, produces pride; and that the same house, still belonging to ourselves, produces humility, when by any accident its beauty is chang'd into deformity, and thereby the sensation of pleasure, which corresponded to pride, is transform'd into pain, which is related to humility. The double

---

[18] Davidson, "Actions, Reasons, and Causes," in *Essays on Actions and Events*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001): 3–19.
[19] Davidson, "How is Weakness of the Will Possible?," in *Essays on Actions and Events*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001): 21–42.
[20] Hume, *Treatise*, 2.1.2.6.3−16.

relation betwixt the ideas and impressions subsists in both cases, and produces an easy transition from the one emotion to the other.[21]

Davidson acknowledges many of the same problems in Hume's account that we have already identified and discussed. Since the purpose of this section is to examine Davidson's Humean account of propositional pride, I shall not recount those problems here or discuss Davidson's take on them. Instead, I shall focus on Davidson's efforts to construct a propositional account of the homeowner's pride.

Like Taylor, Davidson replaces Hume's pleasant sensations with judgments of value. However, unlike Taylor, Davidson opts to represent the value that the homeowner sees in himself, *qua* being the owner of a beautiful house, in terms of his judging himself praiseworthy. In a parenthetical remark, Davidson notes that he "does not insist on using [the word 'praiseworthy']" to describe the homeowner's self-approval.[22] I find it unfortunate that Davidson uses this word, as considerations pertaining to whether or not one is worthy of praise strike me as going beyond the reasons involved in judgments of pride (similarly, I think that considerations concerning whether one is worthy of blame seem to go beyond the reasons involved in judgments of shame). However, this is a matter that goes beyond the scope of this dissertation. So, I offer the caution that we not read too much into Davidsons's choice of words here.

The reason-causes that Davidson cites for this evaluative judgment are (1) the belief that he (*i.e.*, the homeowner) is the owner of the beautiful house and (2) the evaluative judgment that

---

[21] Hume, *Treatise*, 2.1.5.9.7−13. Hume's discussion of the "double impulse," which provides the basis for the double relation of ideas and impressions, appears in 2.1.4.2−4. In 2.1.5.5, he introduces the phrase "double relation of ideas and impressions," and provides a general description of how these relations cause indirect passions like pride and humility. Yet, in the very next paragraph (2.1.5.6), he offers an example that suggests an alternative account of how the double relation operates. And then, four paragraphs later, he provides what seems to be a third account.
[22] Davidson, "Hume's Cognitive Theory of Pride," 285.

anyone who is an owner of a beautiful house is praiseworthy. He arrives at the latter by

attributing to Hume the view that "if someone is proud that he exemplifies a certain property,

then he approves of, or thinks well of, others for exemplifying the same property."[23] In argument

form:

> P1.   All who own a beautiful house are praiseworthy.
> P2.   I own a beautiful house.
> C.   I am praiseworthy.

Davidson claims that this argument takes the (categorical) syllogistic form of Barbara,[24] which

has the mood and figure combination of **AAA**−1, or

> (M)   All P are M.
> (m)   All M are S.
> (C)   All S are P.

> (Where P = the major term, S = the minor term, and M = the middle term.)

While Davidson does not convert any of the propositions into standard-form **A** propositions

(affirmative universal claims), we can do so easily, by assigning the terms as follows: let P =

praiseworthy individuals, S = individuals who are identical to me, and M = owners of a beautiful

house. Putting the claims in Barbara, we get:

> (M)   All owners of a beautiful house are praiseworthy individuals.
> (m)   All individuals who are identical to me are owners of a beautiful house.
> (C)   All persons identical to me are praiseworthy individuals.

Davidson is not satisfied with how he has represented the homeowner's evaluative

judgment in the conclusion. As stated, it represents the owner as judging himself to be

unconditionally praiseworthy. Yet, the case of pride that he wishes to explain is the homeowner's

---

[23] Davidson, "Hume's Cognitive Theory of Pride," 281.
[24] *Ibid*., 285.

being proud of himself *in light of* his being the owner of a beautiful house. Davidson rightly

points out that viewing the homeowner as being unconditionally proud of himself would fail to

acknowledge that it is simply in virtue of his being the owner of the beautiful house that the

homeowner deems himself estimable. Furthermore, to represent the homeowner as being

unconditionally proud of himself would fail to consider that he, despite being proud of his

owning the beautiful house in question, may not be proud of how he acquired the funds to

purchase that house.

In order to represent that the proud homeowner's judgment is relativized to his being an

owner of a beautiful house, Davidson suggests that the conclusion should be "something like, I

am praiseworthy for being the owner of a beautiful house, or I am to be esteemed in that I own a

beautiful house."[25] Davidson recognizes that he shall have to revise the universal claim (what I

have represented as the first premise), too, so that it reflects that the homeowner's approval of

these individuals is relativized to their being the owners of beautiful houses. Were we to modify

the universal claim and the conclusion in the ways that he has suggested, the argument would be:

P1.   All who own a beautiful house are praiseworthy *in that* they own a beautiful
      house.
P2.   I own a beautiful house.
C.   I am praiseworthy *in that* I own a beautiful house.

Davidson does not suggest how we might translate this argument into Barbara. Instead,

he claims that the error in his original proposal is that the middle term "drops out in the

conclusion."[26] But before we discuss what Davidson might have in mind, with respect to how,

exactly, we might correct this error, I would like to point that there is a way in which one could

modify the syllogism above, so that it reflects that the homeowner's judgments of

---

[25] Davidson, "Hume's Cognitive Theory of Pride," 285.
[26] *Ibid*.

praiseworthiness are relativized to an individual's being an owner a beautiful house. Were we to

modify the major term, by replacing 'praiseworthy individuals' with 'praiseworthy individuals in

that they are owners of beautiful houses,' we would get the following syllogism:

(M)	All owners of a beautiful house are praiseworthy individuals in that they are owners of beautiful houses.
(m)	All individuals who are identical to me are owners of a beautiful house.
(C)	All persons identical to me are praiseworthy individuals in that they are owners of beautiful houses.

Seemingly, as long as one accepts 'praiseworthy individuals in that they are owners of a

beautiful house' as being a legitimate class, this syllogism is valid.

What, then, might we make of Davidson's remarks about the need for the middle term to

appear in the conclusion? In "Hume's Analysis of Pride,"[27] Baier suggests that Davidson might

have in mind something like the following, in which we "enrich" the major premise and

conclusion by adding 'considered or viewed as such,' which serves to relativize the evaluations

to a specific grounds.

(M)	All M, considered or viewed as such (*i.e.*, M), are P.
(m)	All S are M.
(C)	All S, considered or viewed as M, are P.[28]

This appears to solve Davidson's problem. When we make our substitutions (letting P =

praiseworthy individuals, S = individuals who are identical to me, and M = owners of a beautiful

house), we get:

---

[27] Annette C. Baier, "Hume's Analysis of Pride," *The Journal of Philosophy* 75, no. 1 (January 1978): 27−40.
[28] *Ibid.*, 33. Baier represents only the major premise as an **A** proposition. So, in an attempt to preserve at least some of the features of Barbara, I have modified the minor premise and conclusion so that they, too, are **A** propositions.

(M)	All owners of a beautiful house, considered or viewed as owners of a beautiful house, are praiseworthy individuals.
(m)	All individuals who are identical to me are owners of a beautiful house.
(C)	All individuals who are identical to me, considered or viewed as owners of a beautiful house, are praiseworthy individuals.[29]

Baier sees virtue in using modifiers like "considered or viewed as," "so far," "*qua*," and "but" in order to capture the complexities that are involved in our evaluations of entities.[30] At the same time, she registers the amount of work that would have to be done before we could use them in an account of reasoning. She points out that before we could accept an enrichment like 'considered or viewed as such,' we would have to determine the logical rules that govern such enrichments. Some of the questions we would have to answer include: How does negation (whether it be internal or external) work in enhanced propositions? Can both of the argument's premises contain an enhancement like 'considered or viewed as such as M,' where in one premise the enhancement is affirmative, but in the other, it is negative? What about an argument's containing an enhancement like 'considered or viewed as M' in the major premise and an enhancement like 'considered or viewed as S' in the minor premise?

To bring her concerns to the surface, Baier has us imagine that the homeowner holds true the evaluative judgment that all payers of high local taxes are praiseworthy, but not in virtue of their being payers of high local taxes. In order to represent this as an enhanced proposition, we would negate the 'considered or viewed as such' constraint and express the evaluative judgment as, "All payers of high local taxes, <u>not</u> considered as such (*i.e.*, as payers of high local taxes), are praiseworthy." In addition, she has us imagine that the homeowner believes that one who pays

[29] *Ibid.*, 33. Baier represents only the major premise as an **A** proposition. So, in an attempt to preserve at least some of the features of Barbara, I have modified the minor premise and conclusion so that they, too, are **A** propositions.
[30] Annette C. Baier, *Postures of the Mind: Essays on Mind and Morals* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1985), 129−32.

high local taxes is praiseworthy only on the grounds that one is an owner of a beautiful house.

The proposition that expresses this belief is, "All owners of beautiful houses, considered or

viewed as such (*i.e.*, as owners of beautiful houses), are praiseworthy." Baier asks whether, given

these two propositions, our homeowner could draw any inference. In short:

> (M)   All payers of high local taxes, but not considered or viewed as such, are praiseworthy.
> (m)   All owners of beautiful houses, considered or viewed as such, are payers of high local taxes.
> _____
> (C)   ?

I agree with Baier that much more work would be required if we wished to systemize

these kinds of enhancement. But what Davidson offers us is the insight that when we feel proud,

our pride "is *prima facie* in character and is given only relative to its ground."[31] And this shows

pride and shame are not global judgments. For we are not proud or ashamed of ourselves or

others globally. Rather, we are proud or ashamed of aspects of those individuals. And the

satisfaction or dissatisfaction that we take is relativized to those grounds.

---

[31] Davidson, "Hume's Cognitive Theory of Pride," 285.

Bibliography

Alanen, Lilli. "The Powers and Mechanisms of the Passions." In *The Blackwell Guide to Hume's "Treatise,"* edited by Saul Traiger, 179–98. Blackwell Guides to Great Works. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2006.

Árdal, Páll S. "Another Look at Hume's Account of Moral Evaluation." *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 15, no. 4 (October 1977): 405–21.

———. "Hume and Davidson on Pride" *Hume Studies* XV, no. 2 (November 1989): 387–94.

———. *Passion and Value in Hume's "Treatise*." 2nd ed. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1989.

Arneson, Richard J. "Shame, Stigma, and Disgust in the Decent Society." *The Journal of Ethics* 11, no. 1 (March 2007): 31–63.

Baier, Annette C. "Hume's Analysis of Pride." *The Journal of Philosophy* 75, no. 1 (January 1978): 27–40.

———. *Postures of the Mind: Essays on Mind and Morals*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1985.

———. "What Emotions are About." *Nôus-Supplement: Philosophical Perspectives (Action Theory and Philosophy of Mind)* 6 (1990): 1–29.

Bricke, John. "Emotion and Thought in Hume's *Treatise*." Supplementary Volume, *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 1, pt. 4 (1974): 53–71.

———. *Mind and Morality: An Examination of Human's Moral Psychology*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.

Buckle, Stephen Buckle. "Hume on the Passions." *Philosophy* 87, no. 2 (April 2012): 189–213.

Burch, Robert. "Hume on Pride and Humility." *The New Scholasticism* 49 (September 1975): 177–88.

Davidson, Donald. "Actions, Reasons, and Causes" In *Essays on Actions and Events*, 2nd ed., 3–19. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

———. "How is Weakness of the Will Possible?" In *Essays on Actions and Events*, 2nd ed., 21–42. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

———. "Hume's Cognitive Theory of Pride." In *Essays on Actions and Events*, 2nd ed., 277–90. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001.

Deigh, John. "Shame and Self-Esteem: A Critique." *Ethics* 93, no. 2 (January 1983): 225−45.

Gardiner, Patrick L. "Hume's Theory of the Emotions." In *David Hume: A Symposium*, edited by David F. Pears, 31–42. London: Macmillan & Co., 1966.

Gordon, Robert M. "Emotions and Knowledge," *Journal of Philosophy* 66, no. 13 (July 3, 1969): 408–13.

———. *The Structure of Emotions: Investigations in Cognitive Philosophy.* Cambridge Studies in Philosophy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Greenspan, Patricia S. *Emotions and Reasons: An Inquiry into Emotional Justification*. New York: Routledge, 1988.

Helm, Bennett W. "Love, Identification, and the Emotions." *American Philosophical Quarterly* 46, no. 1 (January 2009): 39−59.

Hume, David. *A Dissertation on the Passions; The Natural History of Religion*. Critical edition edited by Tom L. Beauchamp. Clarendon Edition of the Works of David Hume, edited by Tom L. Beauchamp, David Fate Norton, and M. A. Stewart, vol. 5. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

———. *A Treatise of Human Nature.* Critical edition edited by David Fate Norton and Mary J. Norton, vol. 1 (*Texts*). Clarendon Edition of the Works of David Hume, edited by Tom L. Beauchamp, David Fate Norton, and M. A. Stewart. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.

Isenberg, Arnold. "Natural Pride and Natural Shame." In *Explaining Emotions*, edited by Amélie Oksenberg Rorty, 355−83. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980.

Morgan, Michael L. *On Shame*. Thinking in Action, edited by Simon Critchley and Richard Kearney. New York: Routledge, 2008.

Scruton, Roger. "Attitudes, Beliefs, and Reasons." In *Morality and Moral Reasoning*, edited by John Casey, 25−100. London: Methuen, 1971.

Taylor, Gabriele. *Pride, Shame and Guilt: Emotions of Self-Assessment*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985.

Williams, Bernard. *Shame and Necessity*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1994.

Wilson, John B. "Shame, Guilt, and Moral Education." *Journal of Moral Education* 30, no. 1

(2001): 71−81.

Wollheim, Richard. *On the Emotions*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1999.