A New View of Emotion*

Stephen Leighton

The demise of James’ theory of emotion, a view that makes feelings the constituents of emotion, sent interested theoreticians in search of a new analysis. One well known response is a behavioral analysis. Behaviorism’s problems have been thoroughly articulated; I do not plan to add to that literature. Rather, I propose to discuss a response that does not share the same limelight, but does tend to prevail (sometimes explicitly, often implicitly) among philosophers. If James’ theory rose to the stature of the “View,” the theory we shall discuss has arisen to the stature of the “New View.”

There are at least two versions of the New View: (1) an emotion is a belief or judgment; (2) an emotion is a complex of judgments.¹ Robert Solomon advocates the New View when he says:

Now we can understand, too, why it is so important to insist not only that an emotion is not identical to a feeling but that a feeling is not even a component of emotion. Of course, emotions may typically involve feelings; they may even always involve feelings. But feelings are neither necessary nor sufficient to differentiate emotions. An emotion is never simply a feeling, even a feeling plus anything.²

An emotion is a judgment (or set of judgments), some thing we do. An emotion is a (set of) judgment(s) which constitute our world.. .An emotion is a basic judgment about our Selves and our place in our world.. (ibid., p. 185).

Errol Bedford argues for this view when he says:

---

* This paper is held in copyright by its author and the American Journal of Philosophy. I would like to expression my appreciation to the latter for the right to reprint this work here.
To discuss the details of these theories would complicate, without affecting, my argument, which is meant to show that an emotion is not any sort of experience or process.  

The expression ‘I hope that...’ implies in addition to a very vague estimate of probability, an assessment of whatever is referred to in the clause that follows (ibid. p. 293).

To generalize from this example: emotion words form part of the vocabulary of appraisal and criticism, and a number of them belong to the more specific language of moral criticism. Normally, the verbs in their first person use imply the speaker’s assessment of some thing, and in their third person use they carry an implication about an assessment by the person they refer to (ibid., p. 294).

**ATTR ACTIONS OF THE NEW VIEW**

The View does not speak of intentionality, and thus has no means to account for the apparent directedness of emotion or the object of emotion. Cognition, however, has an intentional nature and an object. Thus in making judgments the constituents, one can account for the object of emotion and emotion’s intentional nature. Hence construing emotion as a type of cognition seems to explain matters about emotion not explained by the View.

Again, if we suppose emotions to be judgments, we seem to be in a happier position concerning another problem that confounds the View. Our language of emotions is rich, as is our ability to distinguish among emotions. But it is not credible to suppose that we can make all the discriminations we do make in terms of feeling. If emotions are judgments, however, then examining the relevant cognitions should enable us to distinguish among emotions. Joe is envious because he takes Martha’s accomplishment to signify his own inadequacies. Jane is indignant because she takes Martha’s accomplishment to be undeserved. How one judges the matter determines the emotion
present. Should the judgments relevant to two emotion terms be identical, we have
synonymous expressions. Of course, all this has to be refined, especially where the
differences among emotions are subtle. Still, the New View with its attention to cognition
is far more successful in distinguishing among emotions (and recognizing identity) than
is the View with its attention to the way emotions feel.

Another apparent advantage of the New View is that one can readily explain
action through emotion. Were emotion a feeling, why do anything but enjoy it when
pleasant and shun it when unpleasant? Feelings or sensations in themselves provide few
reasons for or causes of action. Thus acting out of fear, hatred, or anger becomes
somewhat mysterious. However, if emotion is a judgment, actions that arise through
emotion are readily explicable. For example, since it is reasonable to avoid danger where
possible and not compromising, and since fear is the judgment that the object is
dangerous, this judgment explains running away and avoiding.5 Further, we can explain
why some emotions do not seem to have actions connected with them. For example, no
action follows from pride’s judgment that its object reflects well upon oneself. The
judgment and therefore the emotion does not lead to action, but has, at most, a display of
emotion.

Again, if emotion is a feeling isolated, problems of a private language arise. In
contrast, when we speak of cognition, no such problems arise.

Although the interest is occurrent emotion, one can see that the New View is
better able to account for dispositional emotion. One does so by speaking of the beliefs
held by the individual. The recollection of or reflection upon these beliefs, in turn,
accounts for the flaring of that emotion. In contrast, a view which supposes that feelings
constitute emotion is unable to distinguish the emergence, say, of a new fear (especially
with the same object) from the flaring of an old one.

Other things recommend the New View, but enough has been said to indicate why
many the cognitive analysis. It accommodates much the View does not. Moreover, it is
particularly amen able to the philosopher’s task of conceptual analysis.
ON THE SURFACE OF IT

Are emotions judgments? Let us begin at a fairly intuitive level. Concerning love, we find that some times when we love (especially at first), we think the beloved wonderful, crediting that person with all sorts of excellences. But we are equally prepared to admit love though the judgments turn sour. For example, Eugene O’Neil depicts families in which the love stands firm, though there remains little good judged of one another. This suggests that the emotions and judgments of the impassioned deserve to be kept quite distinct.

Further, consider the ways we characterize emotion versus the ways we characterize judgments. One makes judgments and judges well or poorly, but one does not make emotions, or emote well or poorly. Again, judgments are said to be good or bad; emotions are not obviously so. And even if one proposes a theory in which emotions are good or bad, this would have to do with their moral appropriateness, benefit to ourselves, etc. This contrasts with judgments being good or bad, roughly speaking, by being true, consistent, correct. Furthermore, we say emotions and emotional states are strong, weak, mild, intense. By saying this we mean to describe the emotions as experienced, though sometimes we mean to comment upon the relevant behavior. If we use these predicates concerning judgments, we do not describe the experience of judgments, nor (in the first instance) the effect upon behavior, but rather the severity of the judgments. Likewise, judgments may be held for a long or short period, but they do not seem to remain in the forefront of one’s mind. In contrast, it is characteristic of emotions to be occurrent over time. Thus we describe the experience of emotions, speaking of them welling up, boiling over, flaring, etc. We do not speak in these ways concerning judgments. These differences in the way we characterize judgments and emotions casts some doubt on the suggestion that emotions are judgments.
BEDFORD

Let us turn from the characterization of emotions and judgments to the specific proposals of judgmental theorists. In holding that judgments are assessments, Bedford means to get at the language of appraisal and criticism.\(^8\) This is to be restricted by the social context or logic of the situation.\(^9\) Bedford reports that a Mr. Davies upon learning that he was the model for Peter Pan was embarrassed. The logic of the situation precludes his emotion being shame because Mr. Davies (knows he) was not responsible for being chosen.

It is unclear whether the emotion is one particular assessment or is many assessments. Thus we distinguish two versions of this theory. As a subscriber to the first version, Bedford takes emotion to be a judgment, while as a subscriber to the second version, he takes emotion to be a group of judgments.\(^{10}\) For example, suppose I fear Peter and judge that he is coming after me, that he is tall, dangerous, etc. The first version picks a judgment (perhaps one based on the above) and identifies it with fear. The second version takes a particular set of these judgments and identifies the set with my fear.

THE FIRST VERSION

Emotion is held to be an assessment; it is a judgment and probably one that rests on subordinate ones. Perhaps what Bedford has in mind is analogous to a course of reasoning: emotion is an assessment (a conclusion) supported by subordinate judgments (premises). Now it is apparent that emotion is not like this. For while premises lead to a conclusion, no supporting judgments lead to a particular emotion. Two people could make the same supporting judgments about a situation, recognize the same implications, but still have different emotional responses. Again, any given person may think all the relevant thoughts, believe all the relevant beliefs, make all the relevant inferences, yet still react fearfully or amusedly—even unemotionally. Thus emotion is not like the conclusion.
Further, it is a commonplace observation that some people never or rarely fear. This need have nothing to do with their reasoning capabilities. What separates the timorous from the fearless is not merely an adjustment in thinking or a change in judgments. Again, those moved to fear too quickly need not be analyzed as bad reasoners or ones who start with inappropriate premises. Doubt less, any of these may reason well or poorly, but their fear cannot be reduced to thawing faulty or correct conclusions. Fear is not analogous to the conclusion of a syllogism; this understanding of emotion as an assessment is wrong.

Now it might be suggested that these arguments rely solely on the premise-conclusion analogy. Since I introduced that analogy to capture the spirit of the New View, we must seek further arguments—lest we be accused of defeating a straw man.

Which judgment is to be the emotion? Not just any judgment will do; otherwise, it could as well be one of the judgments earlier compared with premises. But it is clear that my judgment that Peter is tall is not my fear of him. For if it were that particular judgment, then every time I so judged him I would fear him. Since this is not so, we must ask again which judgment is it to be. Until the criterion can be put more helpfully, the theory has no chance of convincing us.

In fact, we can understand the talk of assessment and evaluation as an attempt to pick out the relevant judgment more precisely than suggested so far. The criterion is that the relevant judgments are those made in the “evaluative” as opposed to “descriptive” mode. William Lyons argues for the importance of evaluative language when he says:

…for different emotions can be generated (mm the very same factual beliefs. I can believe that the mortality rate for free fall parachutists is very high and so infer that the prospects of a free fall parachute drop ending in death is highly probable. My companion might hold the same belief and make the same inference. Now, if we both decide to make a free-fall parachute drop, or are ordered to, I might be in a state of fear, but my companion in a state of excitement.11
This concurs with the argument (above) that judgments do not helpfully point to anything that constitutes fear. Lyons maintains that this is because the judgments are descriptive. He suggests that things are rather different with evaluations.

For my mind might be dominated by the evaluation of the situation as dangerous to me, while my companion’s mind, while allowing that what he is about to do might be dangerous, is taken up by the realization that here is a challenge worthy of him. (Ibid.)

Although Lyons himself is not what I have described as a New View theorist, he helps us to see what the New View theorist might be up to. Emotions are those judgments which are expressed in evaluative language.\textsuperscript{12}

Although this way of understanding the thesis makes it more plausible, the arguments already offered against earlier construals of the New View can be re-employed. The evaluative criterion is inadequate. For that something be judged good, fine, or ugly does not somehow create a particular emotion, or any emotion at all. Further, we want to be able to distinguish emotions, moral judgments, points of etiquette, etc. The evaluative criterion, then, is too broad to be helpful. Moreover, there seems to be no way in which one can independently set forth a subset within the set evaluative judgments such that it is these that are connected with emotions. Certainly, it is the burden of New View theorists to offer this. With few exceptions they have not even attempted this; those who have, have failed; and, as far as I can see, it is not possible.\textsuperscript{13}

Further, even where we can identify evaluative judgments of the right sort, this is still not adequate. For the evaluative judgment may be in place without the presence of the emotion. Consider fear. It is said to be connected with the evaluation of danger. Although this is the relevant evaluation, it is not one’s fear. For every time one focussed on that evaluation one should fear. But that is by no means so. One may well view things as dangerous without fear. I judge Peter to be dangerous to me yet I do not fear him.\textsuperscript{14}

Conversely, it would be very peculiar to suppose of people who are fearless that they do not evaluate things as dangerous. They may well concentrate on the danger; they just do
not do so fearfully; they do not react in fear. Thus even had we a criterion to delimit the relevant evaluations, this would not be to delimit the emotions. For emotions do not even need to follow these evaluations, never mind be constituted by them. It is not the case that the relevant judgments entail the relevant emotion (or any judgment, any emotion). Contrariwise, emotion may be in place without the relevant evaluation. For as we may view something as dangerous without fear, so also we may fear without evaluations of danger. That is, it is not the case that emotion entails the relevant judgment (or any judgment at all). Fear of exams or bugs hardly seems connected with evaluation of danger; sudden frights seem to arise with no evaluations at all.

For all these reasons, the evaluative realm and even a delimited subset thereof would not pick out a particular emotion or any emotion at all. The criterion of evaluations proves to be both too narrow and too broad.

Were one simply to propose that there must be such a judgment (namely, one that assesses), one would beg the question at hand. For our concern is whether there is such a judgment that is emotion. In searching for this judgment among the many the person fearing makes, it will not do simply to stipulate that fear is the judgment that assesses. For which judgment that is and whether, in fact, it is fear is just what we want to discover. Moreover, it seems that whichever judgment (evaluative, or otherwise) one chooses, it will be as unsuccessful as were my judgments that Peter is tall, or dangerous.

THE SECOND VERSION

In the second version emotion is an assessment, but here that means a whole network of judgments rather than a single judgment. The arguments used above can be re-employed to defeat this version. First, consider each judgment within the chosen network, observing that each taken individually is not the emotion. (Recall that my judgment that Peter is tall or dangerous is not my fear.) Second, apply the same criticism to the total set of judgments or any subset. Third, to the claim that the inter locking
network of judgments is not to be dealt with in this way one must reply that a set of anything is just a collection or a collection conjoined. Neither of these suggest a nature of its own that makes a difference to the matter here. Hence the previous criticism applied to the members of the set is correctly applied to the set as a whole or any subset. Fourth, if it is said that we are not talking about a set of judgments, but a network or judgments (and here by “network” we mean something that has its own nature), then either (1) that network is itself a judgment, or (2) it is not a judgment. If it is a judgment (1), then we must ask which judgment. If this question can be answered, then the “my judgment that Peter is tall or dangerous is not my fear” argument is re-applied to this new judgment. If it is not a judgment (2), the New View theorist has abandoned his own position. Fifth, simply stating that the network just is emotion will not do. For whether that is so is what is under scrutiny here. Moreover, that emotion may be present without the judgment tells against this view. Once more, we dispose of the New View. Emotion is not an assessment; nor is it any set of assessments. Thought and emotion are logically distinct.

FURTHER ARGUMENTS

Although it is easy to accede to the “my judgment that Peter is tall or dangerous is not my fear” argument when the judgment is simple, one is more hesitant when the judgments are more complex. Might not there be some complex that captures an emotion? When fully articulated, is not one inclined to think that in these cases, somehow, the complex is emotion? One is drawn to the position Roger Trigg holds regarding an anxious mother.

Her thoughts and her anxiety are not logically distinct. She could not have had the same thoughts without being anxious, because to think about a child’s lateness and to be concerned about it, to view it as an ominous sign, is to be anxious.15 Nonetheless, the previous arguments show that thought and emotion are logically distinct. The articulation of the complex of judgments deemed relevant to anxiety
provides no basis for the collapse of that distinction. Moreover, we should observe that when some mothers reflect upon their children’s lateness, they will be anxious, but surely not all. For one might reflect upon these matters wonderingly, unmoved, despairingly, or (though concerned) still relieved to have the peace and quiet. All this is possible, while according to the New View only anxiety is. The same point emerges in regard to the story Lyons tells about the two parachutists. Although we might accept that viewing the situation as dangerous “seems connected” with fear and that seeing it as a personal challenge “seems connected” with excitement, whatever the connection is, it is not constitution or necessary connection. A difference in evaluation is not the important difference between the two cases. After all, viewing a situation as dangerous to me may be done without emotion, or full of dread, etc., just as viewing the situation as a worthy challenge may be done without emotion, or in paroxysms of fear. Throughout judgment and emotion remain distinct.

Further proof is found in some remarks of Proust.

But my mind, strained by this foreboding, distended like the look which I shot at my mother, would not allow any other impression to enter. Thoughts did, indeed, enter it, but only on the condition that they left behind them every element of beauty, or even of quaintness, by which I might have been distracted or beguiled. As a surgical patient, by means of a local anaesthetic, can look on with a clear consciousness while an operation is being performed upon him yet feel nothing, I could repeat to myself some favorite lines, or watch my grandfather attempting to talk to Swann about the Du d’Audriffet-Pasquier, without being able to kindle any emotion from one or amusement from another.

So upset is this child that he can engage any complex set of judgments he might normally engage, and do so without being moved to the emotion to which he would normally be moved. Although the judgments typically associated with a particular emotion may be present, the corresponding emotion is not. And this affirms the idea that judgment(s) no mailer how complex, might be made sadly, anxiously, happily, disinterestedly, etc.
Although an emotion may be typically associated with certain thoughts, the two are logically separable. Of course, we do not have to take Proust’s word on this matter, but doesn’t he capture our experience?

Both interpretations of the New View fail. One problem has been that the criterion of “assessment” or “evaluation” is inadequate to specify the judgments relevant to emotion. Moreover, taking those judgments proponents of this view claim to be relevant, we find that all the judgments may be made, but the emotion suggested might not be present, not only because of the presence of another emotion, but also because we can make these judgments in rather different ways, e.g. amusedly, sadly, fearfully, or unemotionally. The evaluative judgments howsoever qualified do not govern the emotion present. Further, emotion may be present though evaluation be absent entirely.  

SOLOMON’S CRITERION

For the most part the evaluational theorists have not attempted to provide a criterion for which evaluations they mean. I have argued that no matter what their criterion is, it will not be adequate. But to be thorough we must consider proposals of a more specific nature. Solomon identifies emotion with “self-involved, relatively intense, evaluative judgments” (p. 187). Let us see whether this delimits the emotions.

By “self-involved” Solomon must mean more than that a self is involved. Otherwise, the point would be trivially true, but of no assistance ml delimiting the emotions. Understood as a stronger claim, however, it is false. Suppose I am suddenly frightened by a back-firing car or mildly perturbed by a weather report. Emotion is present in these cases, but not “self-involvement.”

Does the qualification of “intense” upon “evaluative judgments” successfully delimit the emotions? Earlier, I suggested that “intense” was an odd way to describe judgments. Moreover, what sense can be attached to this does not delimit the emotions. Consider what Solomon might mean. It is possible that he means “carefully considered
judgments” when he speaks of “intense judgments.” Although this makes sense of the expression, it does not provide us with the correct analysis of emotion. For even were we to hold that emotions are evaluative judgments, we could not rely on their being carefully considered. Fear sweeps over me; you are struck with joy. Careful consideration is not present in these cases.

Perhaps by “intense” Solomon wants to suggest that the judgment is presently being made. Certainly, if judgments are to constitute occurrent emotions, they ought to correspond. Even so, emotions cannot be identified with active evaluative judgment. For that is as yet too vague, too general, and far too encompassing. My occurrent evaluative judgment that this is a fine computer upon which I work is not an emotion.

Perhaps by “intense” Solomon means “severe” or “harsh.” Although harsh or severe judgments can be made quite emotionally, they need not be so made. Your judgment of these arguments may be very harsh indeed, but you may judge so quite unemotionally. Similarly, an adjudicator of a dance performance may be severe without being emotional.

Most likely by “intense” Solomon means some thing like “with lots of feeling.” But this will not help him. Although we may be prepared to admit that emotions have feeling, this admission runs contrary to Solomon’s proposals. As a New View theorist Solomon tries to remove us from the View to the New View. As we have noted, he claims to attach no importance to feelings. But if what makes this or these judgments an emotion is that they have feelings necessarily involved, then the New View is being abandoned for a view in which feeling is a necessary conjunct of judgment—which is an endorsement of something like Hume’s version of the View.

This pretty well limits what can be said usefully for Solomon’s identification of emotion as a special type of judgment. The failure of his attempt supports our previous conclusions, and lends further credence to the conclusion that no subset of evaluative judgments is (an) emotion.19
GENERAL OBJECTIONS

Let us dispense with the problems of introducing a criterion and the problems of each particular version in order to raise concerns that tell against any thesis that proposes that emotions are some sort(s) of judgment(s).

One of the implications of the New View is that the loss of certain judgments just is the disappearance of emotions. New View theorists have no hesitation about this. “If we discover that ‘the object’ of our fear is not in fact a threat, then we lose our fear” (Trigg, p. 58). On the contrary, a striking feature about emotion is its frequent persistence after the judgments—if there were any—have changed. The discovery that the reasons for my fear of mice are bad ones will force me to abandon certain judgments, and may mark an end to my fear. But, just as likely, my fear may persist temporarily (when an emotion runs deep, we do not often “bounce back” immediately), or even more permanently. The former is fairly common; the latter is less common, and is a candidate for what some call irrational emotions. Both demonstrate that the identification of emotion with judgments will not do.

One might respond that the judgments must persist.

The presence of an emotion depends on our viewing the situation in a particular way. If we stop thinking about it, or come to see it in a different light… our emotion will leave us. Even in the case of such things as irrational fears, there must be a sense in which we believe that something is threatening us, and react to the situation accordingly, even if at the same time we recognize that there is no adequate reason for our apprehension. Until our ‘belief’ can be removed our fear will remain (Trigg, p. 18).

But by enquiring we can discover whether the judgments have changed, find they have, yet find that the emotion lingers. A more tragic example than the one just cited is occasionally seen in the relation ship between parents and children as the children
become adults. The love remains, but the judgments of value have gone. The only thing that could still suggest that the judgments continue would involve reading the judgments off of the emotional reaction itself. Yet such a reading is uncalled for; indeed, it is a simple reiteration of the New View’s belief that to be in a particular emotional state certain specifiable judgments are required. Here this is dogma, not argument. The examples demonstrate that the emotion remains while the judgments change. Hence the two remain distinct. Emotion, like the glow of an electric element, can persist after its source has ceased.¹⁰

One might respond that what glows is the feeling or flushing associated with the emotion, not the emotion. Stated baldly, this begs the question at hand. As an analysis of experience it fails. Take my fear of a mouse, again. No doubt I may be just a little shocked by it all (the feeling persists, but we do not speak of the emotion), but just as well I may be afraid, still. That is, what glows may be my emotion.

A good test for the judgmental view is whether the varieties of emotion can be distinguished in terms of judgments. For if judgments constitute emotions, then through them we must be able to make all the distinctions among emotions we normally do make. Up to this point, we have assumed that this is one of the strengths of the New View. But consider shame and embarrassment. We must agree with Solomon or Bedford that the difference between the two (as far as judgments go) is that shame arises when the matter over which one is emoting is one’s own fault. Despite this, I am often embarrassed, not ashamed, over things I know are my fault. For example, at a party, carelessly spilling a drink over the host. Moreover, one can be ashamed though realizing that it is not one’s fault. Byron is said to have been ashamed of his foot. He could have been so though realizing that he was in no way responsible. I would agree that these people ought not be so moved; but they are. Whether something is appropriate and whether something is present are very different mailers.

Thus even when we set forth the relevant sets of judgments, the emotion can not be those judgments. For the judgments imply one emotion while another may, in fact, be
present. The supposed entailment between cognition and emotion (cf. Solomon, p. 187; Trigg, p. 18) just is not there. Emotion has an independence from judgment and, quite interestingly, trumps it.21

That judgment does not entail emotion and that feelings may trump what judgment indicates shows what freedom we enjoy with the emotions. We often explain and justify our actions by our emotions. According to the New View, justification of the constituent judgments explains and justifies the emotion and behavior. If I am right, then though the justification of judgments relevant may explain the emotion and behavior, (1) it need not and (2) certainly does not itself justify emotion or behavior. For the emotion and behavior need not follow upon the relevant judgments. In consequence, the inevitability of the practical syllogism does not follow. One remains free to react differently.22 This, in turn, explains why we can ask that someone’s emotional reaction be other than it is without asking for a change of judgments. Over and above our responsibility for our judgments we are responsible for our emotions. Such freedom has its dangers as well. A trumping feeling unless subject to the will is not subject to logical diagnosis. Clearing up one’s concepts needn’t resolve the emotional state.

In any case, the trumping of feeling as well as the ability of emotion to persist supports the earlier arguments that emotions are neither judgments nor determined by judgments. Our arguments against the New View lead to the following conclusions: (1) emotion is not identical to judgment; (2) judgment(s) (simple or complex) is (are) never a sufficient condition for emotion; (3) in the cases examined there is no specifiable judgment(s) which is (are) a necessary condition for an emotion. Thus the New View is surely wrong with its sweeping conclusions. Still, this does not foreclose any role for judgment in the analysis of emotion. For we have not yet concluded (4) that there are no cases in which judgment is a necessary condition for emotion. Indeed, this seems to be mistaken. Moreover, the view that (5) there are many cases in which there is no judgment of any sort needs elaboration. Still open, then, is whether there is any role for judgment in emotion, and if so, the part judgment plays.23
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NOTES

1 New View theorists include E. Bedford, C. Pitcher, R. Solomon, It. Trigg, amongst others. By and large they hold the second version of this theory, though, as we shall see, they can be usefully, described as holding the first version.

2 The Passions, (New York: Anchorage Books, 1977), p. 178. Future references to this work will be made in the body of this paper.

3 “Emotions,” Aristotelian Society Proceedings, (19 p. 281. Future references to this work will be made in the body of this paper.

4 Philosophers have endorsed the New View prior the present controversy. Socrates offers something along these lines in the Protagoras (358d) when fear is defined as the expectation of evil. Again, in response to the Aristotelian analysis Chrysippus presents the New View. (cf. Stoicorum Veriteim, Fragmente I 459).

5 Thus reference to the judgments that constitute emotion allows one to generate practical syllogisms.

6 I make judgments my target, since they are the most frequent subject for the New View. Nevertheless, corresponding arguments can be made about beliefs, etc.

7 Though the display of emotion may be done in a better or worse way.

8 We could as well choose Pitcher’s or Solomon’s analysis of emotions as evaluations. All point in the same direction.

9 Bedford also has a behavioral criterion, but we need not concern ourselves with it here. Its plausibility as a helpful component of the analysis seems to have been undermined by J. L. Austin’s “Pretending.” Further, it does not help to pick out emotion. According to Bedford there must be some behavior for emotion, but there is no particular or specifiable behavior.
10 Most theorists of the first version at times sound like theorists of the second version, and vice versa. This probably indicates no inconsistency on their part, but only indicates that the same thing can be described as a complex judgment or as a number of simple ones. Still, we should not assume that an argument against the first version constitutes an argument against the second.

11 *Emotion*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1980), p. 35. Future references to this work will be found in the body of this paper.

12 We must have some qualms about interpreting Bedford in this way. For Bedford is often concerned with the objective facts of the situation (cf. pp. 291-293, 295). The language of emotion is meant to make objective claims unless there are special precautions to undermine them (p. 120). As the quotation from Lyons shows, there are problems here. Thus either Bedford’s position breaks down, or we interpret him as in accord with Lyons. “Assessment” might suggest the latter, as do some of Bedford’s remarks. Generosity dictates that we should see Bedford in this way. Certainly, the other New View theorists can be understood in this fashion.

13 See the discussion of Solomon to follow.

14 Plotinus, responding to Chrysippus, makes a similar point, arguing that one may hold the opinion appropriate to grief without the feeling or emotion of grief. (*Enneads* 1.1.6).

15 *Pain and Emotion*, (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1970), p. 18. Future references to this work will be made in the body of this paper.

16 It is enough to note that these same judgments may be made in the emotional state of anxiety or without emotion to prove that thought does not entail emotion. However, when we consider the many emotional states possible for the mother, given the same judgments, all attachment to the New View must be dismissed.


18 In speaking of emotions as evaluations, Pitcher usually speaks of beliefs and judgments. Hence the above arguments apply. At times, however, (P’s reaction of anger when slapped by Q) Pitcher observes that talk of beliefs and judgments is not quite right. I agree and would use this example to point to the insufficiency in the New View. Pitcher does not take it in this way, but says that the emotional response itself must be seen as a negative evaluation. This is odd. Lyons rightly observes that behavior is not itself an evaluation. Certainly, this notion of “evaluation” has been left unexplained, and does not help a cognitive analysis.

19 Problems with Solomon’s theory run deeper than so far observed. For even if all emotions are self-involved, relatively intense evaluative judgments, all such judgments
are not emotions. The decision to betray their country by Burgess and Blunt were intense, self-involved, evaluative judgments. They were not emotions. A further difficulty with Solomon’s analysis (and seemingly any version of the New View) is that it makes “emotional judgment” redundant. Clearly, it is not.

20 Aristotle (De Memoria et Reminiscentia, 453a15-30) is the first philosopher I know of to observe this persistence. His explanation has to do with the continuance of bodily motions once initiated.

21 The dispute is this. The judgmental view will talk about the (perceived) logic of the situation, supposing that the judgments of the situation will determine the emotion. For example, Trigg (page 98) claims that if the pang is like that of anxiety, but the situation is (perceived as) one of disappointment, the pang is one of disappointment. Judgments trump. This I find too rigid. Without denying judgments a place, I hold that feelings may trump. Again, Austin (in “Other Minds” Collected Papers, page 110) speaks of the overriding power of the pattern. The pattern is thought to determine the emotion present. Without doubting that this can be a good explanation, I note that the overriding may go the other way. The feeling present may override the pattern.

22 To the extent that the painful is avoided and the pleasant pursued, a trumping feeling could help explain acratic action.

23 I am grateful to D. Browning and A. Martinich for their comments on earlier versions of this paper.