Introduction: A. J. Ayer was born in London in 1910. He studied philosophy at Christ Church College at Oxford University and received his degree in 1932. After additional study at the University of Vienna, he returned to Oxford in 1933 to become a lecturer at Christ Church College and then a research fellow. He served in the British Army during World War II and then returned to philosophy, accepting a position in 1945 as teaching fellow and dean of Wadham College at Oxford. The following year Ayer was appointed Grote Professor in the Philosophy of Mind at University College, London. In 1959 he returned to Oxford as Wykeham Professor of Logic, a position he held until his retirement in 1978. Ayer died in London in 1989.


Our reading is from Chapter 6 of Language, Truth and Logic, “Critique of Ethics and Theology.” Ayer holds that the function of ethical philosophy is to explore the meaning of ethical terms, and not to make judgments about what is right and wrong. Many philosophers maintain that the main task of ethics is to make moral judgments, and that these judgments are propositions that are true or false. For example, someone might say “Stealing is wrong” and claim that this is true. Ayer rejects this theory of the meaning of ethical terms. Ethical judgments are not propositions at all, despite their grammatical form; they are simply expressions of emotion or attempts to arouse emotion in others. They are neither true nor false because they are not assertions of fact. To say “Stealing is wrong” is to express feelings of disapproval to try to dissuade other people from stealing. “Stealing is wrong” is no more a statement of fact than “Alas!” or “Hooray!”

Ayer distinguishes his emotive theory about the meaning of ethical terms from two theories that claim that ethical judgments are assertions of fact. According to subjectivism, an ethical judgment is an assertion of the feeling of approval by the speaker or by a group. But this theory is mistaken, since it is not contradictory for a speaker to say that he or she approves of something immoral, or for someone to say what a group approves is immoral. According to utilitarianism, a moral action is one that promotes the greatest happiness for all concerned. But this theory is incorrect because it is not self-contradictory to say that an action that promotes the greatest happiness is immoral. In Ayer’s emotive theory of ethics, ethical judgments do not express any sort of fact at all; they “do not say anything. They are pure expressions of feeling and as such do not come under the category of truth and falsehood.”

—Donald Abel

… It is our business to give an account of “judgments of value” which is both satisfactory in itself and consistent with our general empiricist principles. We shall set ourselves to show that insofar as statements of value are significant, they are ordinary “scientific” statements; and that insofar as they are not scientific, they are not in the literal sense significant, but are simply expressions of emotion, which can be neither true nor false. The ordinary system of ethics, as elaborated in the works of ethical philosophers, is very far from being a homogeneous whole. Not only is it apt to contain pieces of metaphysics, and analyses of nonethical concepts: its actual ethical contents are themselves of very different kinds. We may divide them, indeed, into four main classes. There are, first of all, propositions which express definitions of ethical terms, or judgments about the legitimacy or possibility of certain definitions. Secondly, there are propositions describing the phenomena of moral experience, and their causes. Thirdly, there are exhortations to moral virtue. And lastly, there are actual ethical judgments. It is unfortunately the case that the distinction between these four classes, plain as it is, is commonly ignored by ethical philosophers—with the result that it is often very difficult to tell from their works what it is that they are seeking to discover or prove.

In fact, it is easy to see that only the first of our four classes, namely, that which comprises the propositions relating to the definitions of ethical terms, can be said to constitute ethical philosophy. The propositions which describe the phenomena of
moral experience, and their causes, must be assigned to the science of psychology or sociology. The exhortations to moral virtue are not propositions at all, but ejaculations or commands which are designed to provoke the reader to action of a certain sort. Accordingly, they do not belong to any branch of philosophy or science. As for the expressions of ethical judgments, we have not yet determined how they should be classified. But inasmuch as they are certainly neither definitions nor comments upon definitions, nor quotations, we may say decisively that they do not belong to ethical philosophy. A strictly philosophical treatise on ethics should therefore make no ethical pronouncements. But it should, by giving an analysis of ethical terms, show what is the category to which all such pronouncements belong. And this is what we are now about to do.

A question which is often discussed by ethical philosophers is whether it is possible to find definitions which would reduce all ethical terms to one or two fundamental terms. But this question, though it undeniable belongs to ethical philosophy, is not relevant to our present inquiry. We are not now concerned to discover which term, within the sphere of ethical terms, is to be taken as fundamental; whether, for example, "good" can be defined in terms of "right" or "right" in terms of "good," or both in terms of "value." What we are interested in is the possibility of reducing the whole sphere of ethical terms to nonethical terms. We are inquiring whether statements of ethical value can be translated into statements of empirical fact.

That they can be so translated is the contention of those ethical philosophers who are commonly called subjectivists, and of those who are known as utilitarians. For the utilitarian defines the rightness of actions, and the goodness of ends, in terms of the pleasure, or happiness, or satisfaction, to which they give rise; the subjectivist, in terms of the feelings of approval which a certain person, or group of people, has towards them. Each of these types of definition makes moral judgments into a subclass of psychological or sociological judgments; and for this reason they are very attractive to us. For, if either was correct, it would follow that ethical assertions were not generally different from the factual assertions which are ordinarily contrasted with them; and the account which we have already given of empirical hypotheses would apply to them also.

Nevertheless we shall not adopt either a subjectivist or a utilitarian analysis of ethical terms. We reject the subjectivist view that to call an action right, or a thing good, is to say that it is generally approved of, because it is not self-contradictory to assert that some actions which are generally approved of are not right, or that some things which are generally approved of are not good. And we reject the alternative subjectivist view that a man who asserts that a certain action is right, or that a certain thing is good, is saying that he himself approves of it, on the ground that a man who confessed that he sometimes approved of what was bad or wrong would not be contradicting himself. And a similar argument is fatal to utilitarianism. We cannot agree that to call an action right is to say that of all the actions possible in the circumstances it would cause, or be likely to cause, the greatest happiness, or the greatest balance of pleasure over pain, or the greatest balance of satisfied over unsatisfied desire, because we find that it is not self-contradictory to say that it is sometimes wrong to perform the action which would actually or probably cause the greatest happiness, or the greatest balance of pleasure over pain, or of satisfied over unsatisfied desire. And since it is not self-contradictory to say that some pleasant things are not good, or that some bad things are desired, it cannot be the case that the sentence "x is good" is equivalent to "x is pleasant," or to "x is desired." And to every other variant of utilitarianism with which I am acquainted the same objection can be made. And therefore we should, I think, conclude that the validity of ethical judgments is not determined by the felicific tendencies of actions, any more than by the nature of people's feelings; but that it must be regarded as "absolute" or "intrinsic," and not empirically calculable.

If we say this, we are not, of course, denying that it is possible to invent a language in which all ethical symbols are definable in nonethical terms, or even that it is desirable to invent such a language and adopt it in place of our own; what we are denying is that the suggested reduction of ethical to nonethical statements is consistent with the conventions of our actual language. That is, we reject utilitarianism and subjectivism, not as proposals to replace our existing ethical notions by new ones, but as analyses of our existing ethical notions. Our contention is simply that, in our language, sentences which contain normative ethical symbols are not equivalent to sentences which express psychological propositions, or indeed empirical propositions of any kind.

It is advisable here to make it plain that it is only normative ethical symbols, and not descriptive ethical symbols, that are held by us to be indefinable in factual terms. There is a danger of confusing these two types of symbols, because they are commonly constituted by signs of the same sensible form. Thus a complex sign of the form "x is wrong" may constitute a sentence which expresses a moral judgment concerning a certain type of conduct, or it may constitute a sentence which states that a certain type of conduct is repugnant to the moral sense of a particular society. In the latter case, the symbol "wrong" is a descriptive ethical symbol, and the sentence in which it occurs expresses an ordinary sociological proposition; in the former case, the symbol "wrong" is a normative ethical symbol, and the sentence in which it occurs does not, we maintain, express an empirical proposition at all. It is only with normative ethics that we are at present concerned; so that whenever ethical symbols are used in the course of this argument without qualification, they are always to be interpreted as symbols of the normative type.

In admitting that normative ethical concepts are irreducible to empirical concepts, we seem to be leaving the way clear for the "absolutist" view of ethics—that is, the view that statements of value are not controlled by observation, as ordinary empirical propositions are, but only by a mysterious "intellectual intuition." A feature of this theory, which is seldom recognized by its advocates, is that it makes statements of value unverifiable. For it is notorious that what seems intuitively certain to one person may seem doubtful, or even false, to another. So that unless it is possible to provide some criterion by which one may decide between conflicting intuitions, a mere appeal to intuition is worthless as a test of a proposition's validity. But in the case
of moral judgments, no such criterion can be given. Some moralists claim to settle the matter by saying that they “know” that their own moral judgments are correct. But such an assertion is of purely psychological interest, and has not the slightest tendency to prove the validity of any moral judgment. For dissentient moralists may equally well “know” that their ethical views are correct. And, as far as subjective certainty goes, there will be nothing to choose between them. When such differences of opinion arise in connection with an ordinary empirical proposition, one may attempt to resolve them by referring to, or actually carrying out, some relevant empirical test. But with regard to ethical statements, there is, on the “absolutist” or “intuitionist” theory, no relevant empirical test. We are therefore justified in saying that on this theory ethical statements are held to be unverifiable. They are, of course, also held to be genuine synthetic propositions.6

Considering the use which we have made of the principle that a synthetic proposition is significant only if it is empirically verifiable,7 it is clear that the acceptance of an “absolutist” theory of ethics would undermine the whole of our main argument. And as we have already rejected the “naturalistic”8 theories which are commonly supposed to provide the only alternative to “absolutism” in ethics, we seem to have reached a difficult position. We shall meet the difficulty by showing that the correct treatment of ethical statements is afforded by a third theory, which is wholly compatible with our radical empiricism.

We begin by admitting that the fundamental ethical concepts are unanalyzable, inasmuch as there is no criterion by which one can test the validity of the judgments in which they occur. So far we are in agreement with the absolutists. But, unlike the absolutists, we are able to give an explanation of this fact about ethical concepts. We say that the reason why they are unanalyzable is that they are mere pseudoconcepts. The presence of an ethical symbol in a proposition adds nothing to its factual content. Thus if I say to someone, “You acted wrongly in stealing that money,” I am not stating anything more than if I had simply said, “You stole that money.” In adding that this action is wrong I am not making any further statement about it. I am simply evincing my moral disapproval of it. It is as if I had said, “You stole that money,” in a peculiar tone of horror, or written it with the addition of some special exclamation marks. The tone, or the exclamation marks, adds nothing to the literal meaning of the sentence. It merely serves to show that the expression of it is attended by certain feelings in the speaker.

If now I generalize my previous statement and say, “Stealing money is wrong,” I produce a sentence which has no factual meaning—that is, expresses no proposition which can be either true or false. It is as if I had written “Stealing money!”—where the shape and thickness of the exclamation marks show, by a suitable convention, that a special sort of moral disapproval is the feeling which is being expressed. It is clear that there is nothing said here which can be true or false. Another man may disagree with me about the wrongness of stealing, in the sense that he may not have the same feelings about stealing as I have, and he may quarrel with me on account of my moral sentiments. But he cannot, strictly speaking, contradict me. For in saying that a certain type of action is right or wrong, I am not making any factual statement, not even a statement about my own state of mind. I am merely expressing certain moral sentiments. And the man who is ostensibly contradicting me is merely expressing his moral sentiments. So that there is plainly no sense in asking which of us is in the right, for neither of us is asserting a genuine proposition.

What we have just been saying about the symbol “wrong” applies to all normative ethical symbols. Sometimes they occur in sentences which record ordinary empirical facts besides expressing ethical feeling about those facts; sometimes they occur in sentences which simply express ethical feeling about a certain type of action, or situation, without making any statement of fact. But in every case in which one would commonly be said to be making an ethical judgment, the function of the relevant ethical word is purely “emotive.” It is used to express feeling about certain objects, but not to make any assertion about them.

It is worth mentioning that ethical terms do not serve only to express feeling. They are calculated also to arouse feeling, and so to stimulate action. Indeed some of them are used in such a way as to give the sentences in which they occur the effect of commands. Thus the sentence “It is your duty to tell the truth” may be regarded both as the expression of a certain sort of ethical feeling about truthfulness and as the expression of the command “Tell the truth.” The sentence “You ought to tell the truth” also involves the command “Tell the truth,” but here the tone of the command is less emphatic. In the sentence “It is good to tell the truth” the command has become little more than a suggestion. And thus the “meaning” of the word “good,” in its ethical usage, is differentiated from that of the word “duty” or the word “ought.” In fact we may define the meaning of the various ethical words in terms both of the different feelings they are ordinarily taken to express, and also the different responses which they are calculated to provoke.

We can now see why it is impossible to find a criterion for determining the validity of ethical judgments. It is not because they have an “absolute” validity, which is mysteriously independent of ordinary sense experience, but because they have no objective validity whatsoever. If a sentence makes no statement at all, there is obviously no sense in asking whether what it says is true or false. And we have seen that sentences which simply express moral judgments do not say anything. They are pure expressions of feeling and as such do not come under the category of truth and falsehood. They are unverifiable for the same reason as a cry of pain or a word of command is unverifiable—because they do not express genuine propositions.

Thus, although our theory of ethics might fairly be said to be radically subjectivist, it differs in a very important respect from the orthodox subjectivist theory. For the orthodox subjectivist does not deny, as we do, that the sentences of a moralizer express genuine propositions. All he denies is that they express propositions of a unique nonempirical character. His own view is that they express propositions about the speaker’s feelings. If this were so, ethical judgments clearly would be capable of being true or false. They would be true if the speaker had the relevant feelings, and false if he had not. And this is a matter which is, in principle, empirically verifiable. Furthermore they could be significantly contradicted. For if I say, “Tolerance is a
about questions of value. To take a typical example: If a man about his feelings, it would be impossible to argue out by Moore that if ethical statements were simply statements of fact, we would be contradicting ourselves. It has been pointed out by Moore that if ethical statements were directly connected with the fact of the statement, then it would be impossible to argue that one is a virtue, and another replied that it is a vice, we could not hold that such sentences as “Toleration is a virtue” and “Toleration is a vice” do not express propositions at all, we clearly cannot hold that they express incompatible propositions. We must therefore admit that if Moore’s argument really refutes the ordinary subjectivist theory, it also refutes ours. But, in fact, we deny that it does refute even the ordinary subjectivist theory. For we hold that one really never does dispute about questions of value.

This may seem, at first sight, to be a very paradoxical assertion. For we certainly do engage in disputes which are ordinarily regarded as disputes about questions of value. But in all such cases we find, if we consider the matter closely, that the dispute is not really about a question of value, but about a question of fact. When someone disagrees with us about the moral value of a certain action or type of action, we do admittedly resort to argument in order to win him over to our way of thinking. But we do not attempt to show by our arguments that he has the “wrong” ethical feeling towards a situation whose nature he has correctly apprehended. What we attempt to show is that he is mistaken about the facts of the case. We argue that he has misconceived the agent’s motive, or that he has misjudged the effects of the action or its probable effects in view of the agent’s knowledge, or that he has failed to take into account the special circumstances in which the agent was placed. Or else we employ more general arguments about the effects which actions of a certain type tend to produce, or the qualities which are usually manifested in their performance. We do this in the hope that we have only to get our opponent to agree with us about the nature of the empirical facts for him to adopt the same moral attitude towards them as we do. And as the people with whom we argue generally receive the same moral education as ourselves, and live in the same social order, our expectation is usually justified. But if our opponent happens to have undergone a different process of moral “conditioning” from ourselves, so that, even when he acknowledges all the facts, he still disagrees with us about the moral value of the actions under discussion, then we abandon the attempt to convince him by argument. We say that it is impossible to argue with him because he has a distorted or undeveloped moral sense—which signifies merely that he employs a different set of values from our own. We feel that our own system of values is superior, and therefore speak in such derogatory terms of his. But we cannot bring forward any arguments to show that our system is superior. For our judgment that it is so is itself a judgment of value, and accordingly outside the scope of argument. It is because argument fails us when we come to deal with pure questions of value, as distinct from questions of fact, that we finally resort to mere abuse.

In short, we find that argument is possible on moral questions only if some system of values is presupposed. If our opponent concurs with us in expressing moral disapproval of all actions of a given type, then we may get him to condemn a particular action A, by bringing forward arguments to show that A is of type t. For the question whether A does or does not belong to that type is a plain question of fact. Given that a man has certain moral principles, we argue that he must, in order to be consistent, react morally to certain things in a certain way. What we do not and cannot argue about is the validity of these moral principles. We merely praise or condemn them in the light of our own feelings.

If anyone doubts the accuracy of this account of moral disputes, let him try to construct even an imaginary argument on a question of value which does not reduce itself to an argument about a question of logic or about an empirical matter of fact. I am confident that he will not succeed in producing a single example. And if that is the case, he must allow that its involving
the impossibility of purely ethical arguments is not, as Moore
thought, a ground of objection to our theory, but rather a point
in favor of it.

Having upheld our theory against the only criticism which
appeared to threaten it, we may now use it to define the nature
of all ethical inquiries. We find that ethical philosophy consists
simply in saying that ethical concepts are pseudoconcepts and
therefore unanalyzable. The further task of describing the dif-
ferent feelings that the different ethical terms are used to ex-
press, and the different reactions that they customarily provoke,
is a task for the psychologist. There cannot be such a thing as
ethical science, if by ethical science one means the elaboration
of a “true” system of morals. For we have seen that, as ethical
judgments are mere expressions of feeling, there can be no way
of determining the validity of any ethical system, and, indeed,
no sense in asking whether any such system is true. All that one
may legitimately inquire in this connection is, what are the
moral habits of a given person or group of people, and what
causes them to have precisely those habits and feelings? And
this inquiry falls wholly within the scope of the existing social
sciences.

Notes

1. **empiricist**: relating to **empiricism**, the doctrine that all knowl-
edge is based on sense experience [D. C. Abel, Editor]

2. **significant** literally means “signifying,” that is, “being a
sign” that points to something. [D. C. Abel]

3. **metaphysics**: the study of the nature and kinds of reality [D.
C. Abel]

4. **felicific**: causing happiness [D. C. Abel]

5. **Normative ethics** establishes criteria (norms) for determining
what is right and wrong. [D. C. Abel]

6. **synthetic propositions**: propositions in which the predicate
adds something to the subject (distinguished from analytic
propositions, in which the predicate is contained in the sub-
ject) [D. C. Abel]

is that a synthetic proposition is significant (has meaning)
only if “some possible sense-experience should be relevant
to the determination of its truth or falsehood” (Preface). [D.
C. Abel]

8. “**naturalistic**”: based on the claim that moral concepts can be
explained entirely in terms of natural facts. Ayer refers here
to the theories of subjectivism and utilitarianism, which he
has rejected. [D. C. Abel]

was a British philosopher. [D. C. Abel]