

## ANALYTICAL TABLE OF CONTENTS

	page
I. EVALUATING	
i. In this work justification of morality in terms of a principle external to states of mind will be advanced as against "autonomous" morality appealing to one's own mental state.	19
ii. "Morality" is a vague term, not clearly distinguished from the practical as such. Hare's assumption of a special logic of moral discourse is questioned.	19
iii. Insufficiency of a purely linguistic approach.	20
iv. Discussion of R. M. Hare's theory of descriptive and prescriptive meaning and its internal inconsistencies.	20
v. Prescriptives are to be distinguished from imperatives. Comparison with Aquinas. The presupposition of freedom in talk of obligation.	25
vi. Ideals cannot be divorced, as if optional, from moral principles.	30
vii. Hare's criterion of universalizability is found to be vacuous. Rather than universalize the particular judgment, we in fact reason from the universal to the particular. A priori logical principles alone cannot yield moral judgment.	31
viii. Hare merges theory with action in typical ideological fashion so that inconsistency between the two is impossible. But the category of psychological im-	35

possibility he needs to protect this merging is logically incoherent. The non-descriptive account of "good" as approval is found to be absurd, as is the type of liberty of conscience based on it. A more objective account of "good" (by Geach) is discussed.

- |       |  |    |
|-------|--|----|
| ix.   | Rejection of the "naturalistic fallacy" as arguing from a mere formal possibility of speech.   | 39 |
| x.    | The same applies to the Humean treatment of "ought". "Is" and "ought" talk should rather be contrasted in terms of differing operations of theoretical and practical reason.   | 41 |
| xi.   | Principles are discussed in terms of an article by Philippa Foot, who distinguished verbal principles from non-verbal ones. Ways of "having" a principle in terms of behaviour, animal or human, which are primarily a matter of being subject to explanation. | 43 |
| xii.  | Foot's notion of background to moral judgment as a collection of virtues and vices ranging over the whole field of human action. Evaluation cannot be divorced from prescription.  | 47 |
| xiii. | The dichotomy of fact and value criticized in terms of Urmson's notion of grading. The background may be taken to be human nature.   | 50 |

## II. CONSCIENCE

- |    |   |    |
|----|---|----|
| i. | Conscience provides a link between autonomist and natural law theories. It is right to do what seems right. | 55 |
|----|---|----|

	<b>page</b>
ii. Yet following conscience is not the fundamental duty. We know we should do good without having to consider conscience. It is a second-order notion.	56
iii. The character of practical reason as a system of law.	57
iv. The reality of law as informing conscience. Anselm's theory of <b>rectitudo</b> . Happiness is not the formal practical criterion.	59
v. Criteria for moral laws, if not self-evident, require authority. The notion of being placed in the world as a determinant of duty, exemplified by the child's position. Internal necessity of tradition in moral reasoning. Universal laws need not be universally obeyed.	61
vi. Philosophy itself is subject to moral considerations. Practical reason rules the <b>exercise</b> of speculation and is not generated out of it.	64

### III. LAW

i. Comparison of moral and religious education in their relation to personal autonomy.	69
ii. The problem of the fallibility of conscience compared to that of memory. We have nothing better to rely on.	75
iii. The binding character of law as law.	76
iv. Law and the purpose of law. We can know it has a purpose but need not always know what that purpose is.	77

	page
v. Desire can never abrogate law.	79
vi. Law relates one to a community. Criticism of Kant. Law an expression of rationality. Who legislates? Reason? Whose reason? We consult the law to which we are subject.	81
vii. The concept of ideal reason is unclear. The world cannot be thought of as independent of reason.	85
viii. Winch's attempt to tie moral truth to particular societies is not coherent.	86
ix. Arrival at a definition of law.	90

#### IV. NATURE

i. The rational way of life is the human way of life. Here we ask what are the criteria for laws of human nature. The first principle, that good is to be done, or pursued.	93
ii. A second principle, that of self-preservation (cp. Hobbes), is easily extended to that of the species as a whole, yielding principles about marriage, sexual behaviour and education, toleration etc. The order of the precepts mirrors the order of human inclinations (Aquinas). Yet they are precepts and so not themselves subject to inclination. Problem of duty and satisfaction. Role of hope in life of virtue.	98
iii. Contractualism. Can there be "outlaws"? The Femgericht. Impossibility of total depravity. Knowledge of moral law remains intact.	101
iv. The example of the "free speech" issue. It is not contradictory to hold the opinion that something is not a matter of opinion. The fallacy of "meta-ethics."	106

## V. NATURAL LAW AND SECULARISM

- |      |   |     |
|------|---|-----|
| i.   | Discussion of Donagan's rejection of Anscombe's claim that law in morals implies a divine law-giver.              | 111 |
| ii.  | It is not that the law is enjoined by reason but that reason reflects the divine and is therefore itself law.     | 117 |
| iii. | The spirituality of reason; Pieper's account.   | 121 |
| iv.  | Failure of Donagan's argument.  | 124 |
| v.   | The polemic against natural theology. Its link with the Averroist two-truths theory. Common morality is theistic. | 127 |
| vi.  | Divorcing the moral law from its theistic roots distorts it. Discussion of double effect and killing.             | 136 |

## VI. TELEOLOGY, OBLIGATION, HAPPINESS

- |      |  |     |
|------|--|-----|
| i.   | All action, being done well or badly for good or bad ends, is a matter of virtue or vice and is as such moral and subject to law. But if law in the mind can only be given by God then reason may be called an image of the divine and the notion of sin is made comprehensible. | 151 |
| ii.  | The claim of reason to know truth supports this view. A divine foundation is required for all knowledge as much as for moral law, by the same argument. Theism is the natural centre of philosophy.  | 153 |
| iii. | How to reconcile teleology and obligation.   | 157 |
| iv.  | The question of reason's justification is genuine.   | 160 |
| v.   | Criticism of Kantian theories of rational willing.   | 162 |

	page
vi. The primacy of wants over practical reason. Being practical means being an instrument of wants.	164
vii. Rational plan of life versus natural inclinations.	166
viii. Choice, deliberation, freedom, reason.	168
ix. That reason itself, man himself, can be a (non-natural) end is a fiction. The Kantian argument for human dignity from mere indeterminacy is fallacious, as Sartre showed.	170
x. A grammatical point: how can an object be an end?	172
xi. The moral law is not a means to happiness, since happiness is part of it. Arguments for there being one ultimate purpose. Ends exist in the mind as part of the action before they are brought about.	173
xii. Not to seek happiness is impossible, even when I am "unselfish".	175
xiii. Teleology and obligations are only reconciled on a theistic view.	178
xiv. Altruism is logically impossible. The lawless only appear happy. Self-love fulfilled in love of God.	179

## VII. THEODICY

Various arguments against divine goodness as source and authority of moral law are discussed.	187
---	-----

NOTES	203
-------	-----

BIBLIOGRAPHY	209
--------------	-----

INDEX OF PROPER NAMES	213
-----------------------	-----