

Honor

INTRODUCTION

THE notions of honor and fame are sometimes used as if their meanings were interchangeable, and sometimes as if each had a distinct connotation. In the tradition of the great books, both usages will be found. It is seldom just a matter of words. The authors who see no difference between a man's honor and his fame are opposed on fundamental issues of morality to those who think the standards of honor are independent of the causes of fame. This opposition will usually extend to psychological issues concerning human motivation and to political issues concerning power and justice. It entails contrary views of the role of rewards and punishments in the life of the individual and of society.

Praise and blame seem to be common elements in the significance of fame and honor. The meaning of honor seems to involve in addition the notion of worth or dignity. But whether a man is virtuous or not, whether he *deserves* the good opinion of his fellowmen, does not seem to be the indispensable condition on which his fame or infamy rests. Nor does his good or ill repute in the community necessarily signify that he is a man of honor or an honorable man. Where others consider what it means for a person to be honorable, Nietzsche substitutes the notion of nobility. Nietzsche's hero, the superman, is noble.

The connection and distinction of these terms would therefore appear to be the initial problem of this chapter. Any solution of the problem must consider the relation of the individual to the community, and the standards by which the individual is appraised—by himself and his fellowmen. Honor and fame both seem to imply public approval, but

the question is whether both presuppose the same causes or the same occasions for social esteem.

"The manifestation of the value we set on one another," writes Hobbes, "is that which is commonly called Honoring and Dishonoring. To value a man at a high rate, is to *honor* him; at a low rate, is to *dishonor* him. But high and low, in this case, is to be understood by comparison to the rate that each man setteth on himself." Does Hobbes mean that the value a man sets on himself is the true standard of his worth? Apparently not. Let men, he says, "rate themselves at the highest value they can; yet their true value is no more than it is esteemed by others." What, then, is the measure of such esteem? "The *value*, or worth of a man," answers Hobbes, "is as of all other things, his price; that is to say, so much as would be given for the use of his power; and therefore, is not absolute but a thing dependent on the need and judgment of another."

Here, then, honor is not what a man has in himself, but what he receives from others. Honor is paid him. He may think himself dishonored if others do not pay him the respect which accords with his self-respect, but their evaluation of him is somehow independent of the standard by which he measures himself. It depends on the relation in which he stands to them, in terms of his power and their need. Virtue and duty—considerations of good and evil, right and wrong—do not enter into this conception of honor. The distinction between honor and fame tends to disappear when honor reflects the opinion of the community, based on the political utility rather than the moral worth of a man.

THERE IS ANOTHER conception of honor which not only separates it from fame, but also makes it independent of public approbation. This is not an unfamiliar meaning of the term. The man who says "on my honor" or "my word of honor" may not be an honest man, but if he is, he pledges himself by these expressions to fulfill a promise or to live up to certain expectations. He is saying that he needs no external check or sanction. A man who had to be compelled by threat or force to honor his obligations would not be acting from a sense of honor.

"It is not for show that our soul must play its part," Montaigne writes. "It is at home, within us, where no eyes penetrate but our own. There it protects us from the fear of death, of pain, and even of shame; there it makes us secure against the loss of our children, of our friends, and of our fortunes; and, when the opportunity presents itself, it also leads us on to the hazards of war." Montaigne quotes Cicero, who claims that all such ventures are "*not for any profit, but for the beauty of merit itself.*"

A sense of honor thus seems to function like a sense of duty. Both reflect the light of conscience. Both operate through an inner determination of the will to do what reason judges to be right in the particular case. If there is a difference between them, it is not so much in their effects as in their causes.

Duty usually involves obligations to others, but a man's sense of honor may lead him to act in a certain way though the good of no other is involved. To maintain his self-respect he must respect a standard of conduct which he has set for himself. Accordingly, a man can be ashamed of himself for doing or thinking what neither injures anyone else nor ever comes to the notice of others. A sense of shame—the reflex of his sense of honor—torments him for having fallen short of his own ideal, for being disloyal to his own conceptions of what is good or right; and his shame may be even more intense in proportion as the standard he has violated is not one shared by others, but is his own measure of what a man should be or do.

Dmitri Karamazov exhibits these mixed feelings of honor and shame when he declares at the preliminary legal investigation: "You have to deal with a man of honor, a man of the highest honor; above all—don't lose sight of it—a man who's done a lot of nasty things, but has always been, and still is, honorable at bottom, in his inner being . . . That's just what's made me wretched all my life, that I yearned to be honorable, that I was, so to say, a martyr to a sense of honor, seeking for it with a lantern, with the lantern of Diogenes, and yet all my life I've been doing filthy things."

The sense of honor and the sense of duty differ in still another respect. Duty presupposes law. The essence of law is its universality. A sense of duty, therefore, leads a man to do what is expected of him, but not of him alone, for he is no different from others in relation to what the law commands. In contrast, a sense of honor presupposes *self-consciousness* of virtue in the individual. It binds him in conscience to live up to the image of his own character, insofar as it has lineaments which seem admirable to him.

Without some self-respect, a man can have no sense of honor. In the great tragic poems, the hero who dishonors himself in his own eyes dies spiritually with the loss of his self-respect. To live on in the flesh thereafter would be almost a worse fate than the physical demise which usually symbolizes the tragic ending. Racine, using the tragic poets as a model, portrays ancient Rome as a place where the striving for honor prohibits Emperor Titus from taking Berenice as his wife; in Racine's world, honor can be as tragic as dishonor. Two centuries later, and under quite different circumstances, honor plays an equally important role in the career of William Dorrit, in the novel by Dickens entitled *Little Dorrit*. In that novel, William Dorrit is not a hero, but he tries to preserve his honor in a debtor's prison. True honor, as displayed by Little Dorrit and Arthur Clennam, is the anonymous performance of one's duty.

THE SENSE IN WHICH a man can honor or dishonor himself is closely akin to the sense in

which he can be honored or dishonored by others. Both involve a recognition of virtue or its violation. But they differ in this: that a man's personal honor is an internal consequence of virtue and inseparable from it, whereas public honor bestowed upon a man is an external reward of virtue. It is not always won by those who deserve it. When it is, "it is given to a man," as Aquinas points out, "on account of some excellence in him, and is a sign and testimony of the excellence that is in the person honored."

When "wealth becomes the foundation of public esteem," Tawney observes, "the mass of men who labor, but who do not acquire wealth, are thought to be vulgar and meaningless and insignificant compared with the few who acquire wealth."

There can be no separation between what a community considers honorable and what it considers virtuous or excellent in mind or character. But it does not necessarily follow that the man who is actually virtuous will always receive the honor which is due him. Public honor can be misplaced—either undeservedly given or unjustly withheld. The virtuous should be prepared for this, in the judgment of Aquinas, since honor is not "the reward for which the virtuous work, but they receive honor from men by way of reward, *as from those who have nothing greater to offer.*" Happiness, he goes on to say, is the "true reward . . . for which the virtuous work; for if they worked for honor, it would no longer be virtue, but ambition."

Tolstoy, however, deplors the injustice of the honor given Napoleon and the dishonor in which Kutuzov was held. "Napoleon," he writes, "that most insignificant tool of history who never anywhere, even in exile, showed human dignity—Napoleon is the object of adulation and enthusiasm; he is *grand*. But Kutuzov—the man who from the beginning to the end of his activity in 1812, never once swerving by word or deed from Borodino to Vilna, presented an example exceptional in history of self-sacrifice and a present consciousness of the future importance of what was happening—Kutuzov seems to them

something indefinite and pitiful, and when speaking of him and of the year 1812 they always seem a little ashamed."

Kutuzov later received some measure of honor when he was presented with the rarely awarded Order of St. George. But what is perhaps a much higher honor came to him after his death when Tolstoy enshrined him as one of the heroes of *War and Peace*. Sometimes the virtuous or truly honorable man, living in a bad society, goes without honor in his own time to be honored only by posterity. He may even be dishonored by a society which has contempt for virtue. Sometimes a man of indifferent character and achievement, or even one who is actually base and ignoble, wins honor through cleverly simulating the possession of admirable traits.

It seems appropriate to consider the proportion between a man's intrinsic worth and the honor he receives. The distribution of honors raises questions of justice—in fact, it is thought to be one of the chief problems of distributive justice. For those who hold that honor and fame are utterly distinct in principle, this is the clear mark of their difference. Justice does not require that fame be proportionate to virtue. Though there is a sense in which fame may not be deserved, the qualities in a person which justify fame are of a different order from those which honor should reward. Fame belongs to the great, the outstanding, the exceptional, without regard to virtue or vice. Infamy is fame no less than good repute. The great scoundrel can be as famous as the great hero. Existing in the reputation a man has regardless of his character or accomplishments, fame does not tarnish, as honor does, when it is unmerited. But for the same reason, fame is often lost as fortuitously as it is acquired. "Fame has no stability," Aquinas observes; "it is easily ruined by false report. And if it sometimes endures, this is by accident."

Woolf asks the question, "Fame lasts how long?" She goes on to say, "It is permissible even for a dying hero to think before he dies how men will speak of him hereafter. His fame lasts perhaps two thousand years. And what are two thousand years? . . . What, indeed, if

you look from a mountain top down the long wastes of the ages? The very stone one kicks with one's boot will outlast Shakespeare."

THE DISTINCTION between honor and fame is not acknowledged by those who ignore merit as a condition of praise. Machiavelli, for example, places fame—or, as he sometimes calls it, glory—in that triad of worldly goods which men want without limit and without relation to justice. If the aim of life is to get ahead in the world, money, fame, and power are the chief marks of success. A man is deemed no less successful if he acquires power by usurping it, or gains it by foul means rather than fair; so, too, if he becomes famous through chicanery or deception and counterfeits whatever form of greatness men are prone to praise.

Along with riches, fame, says Machiavelli, is "the end which every man has before him." This men seek to obtain by various methods: "one with caution, another with haste; one by force, another by skill; one by patience, another by its opposite; and each one succeeds in reaching the goal by a different method." Some methods, he admits in another place, "may gain empire, but not glory," such as "to slay fellow-citizens, to deceive friends, to be without faith, without mercy, without religion." Nevertheless, he declares: "Let a prince have the credit of conquering and holding a state, the means will always be considered honest, and he will be praised by everybody."

Because fame seems to be morally neutral, it replaces honor in the discussions of those who measure men in terms of success instead of virtue, duty, or happiness. Because it is morally neutral, it is the term used by those who wish to judge, not men, but the impression they make. What counts is the magnitude of that impression, not its correspondence with reality.

To be famous is to be widely, not necessarily well, spoken of by one's fellowmen, now or hereafter. The man who stands above the herd, whose outlines are clear and whose deeds are memorable, takes his place among the famous of his time or of all times. Plutarch the moralist certainly does not regard the men

whose lives he writes as paragons of virtue. On the contrary, he plainly indicates that many of them are examples of extraordinary depravity. But Plutarch the biographer treats them all as famous. He takes that as a matter of historic fact, not of moral judgment. Good or bad, they were acknowledged to be great men, leaders, figures of eminent proportions, engaged in momentous exploits. They were not all victorious. Few if any were successful in all that they attempted or were able to preserve what successes they achieved. But each ventured beyond the pale of ordinary men; and each succeeded at least in becoming a symbol of great deeds, a monument in human memory.

The opposite of fame is anonymity. In Dante's moral universe, only the Trimmers on the rim of Hell are totally anonymous; neither good nor bad, they lack name and fame. Because they "lived without infamy and without praise," Hell will not receive them, "lest the wicked have some glory over them." To them alone no fame can be allowed. Honor and glory belong only to the blessed, but the damned in the pits of Hell, by the record they left for men to revile, are as well remembered, and hence as famous, as the saints in Heaven.

THAT MEN NORMALLY desire the esteem of their fellowmen seems to be undisputed. "He must be of a strange and unusual constitution," Locke writes, "who can content himself to live in constant disgrace and disrepute with his own particular society. Solitude many men have sought, and been reconciled to; but nobody that has the least thought or sense of a man about him, can live in society under the constant dislike and ill opinion of his familiars, and those he converses with. This is a burden too heavy for human sufferance."

A society of misanthropes, despising each other, is as unthinkable as an economy of misers. The social nature of man requires sympathy and fellow feeling, love and friendship, and all of these involve some measure of approval based on knowledge or understanding. According to one theory, the highest type of friendship springs from mutual admiration, the respect which men have for one another. The

old saying that "there is honor among thieves" suggests that even among bad men there is a desire to hold the approbation of those who share a common life. With this in mind apparently, William James describes fame and honor as a man's "image in the eyes of his own 'set,' which exalts or condemns him as he conforms or not to certain requirements that may not be made of one in another walk of life."

Molière takes a much narrower view of honor. Chrysalde in *The School for Wives* declares:

Equating happiness with security,
And making honor lie in one point only!
Cruelty, greed, baseness and double-dealing
Are unimportant, in comparison;
Regardless of one's life and character,
Honor consists in dodging cuckoldry!

Though Pascal regards "the pursuit of glory" as "the greatest baseness of man," he must admit that "it is also the greatest mark of his excellence; for whatever possessions he may have on earth, whatever health and essential comfort, he is not satisfied if he has not the esteem of men. He values human reason so highly that, whatever advantages he may have on earth, he is not content if he is not also ranked highly in the judgment of man . . . Those who most despise men, and put them on a level with brutes, yet wish to be admired and believed by men, and contradict themselves by their own feelings."

But is this universal wish for the esteem of others a desire for honor or a desire for fame? Does it make any difference to our conception of happiness whether we say that men cannot be happy without honor or that they cannot be happy unless they are famous?

Even those who do not distinguish between honor and fame are led by these questions to discriminate between fame and infamy. As we have already noted, fame and infamy are alike, since both involve the notoriety enjoyed by the outstanding, the exceptional, the great, whether good or bad. If what men desire is simply to be known by others, and to have a kind of immortality through living on in the memory of later generations, then evil will serve as well as good repute. All that matters is the size of the reputation, and its vitality. But

if the desire is for approbation or praise, good opinion alone will satisfy, and then the question becomes whether the object is fame or honor. Which does Iago have in mind when he says, "Good name in man and woman, dear my Lord, is the immediate jewel of their souls"?

Opposite answers seem to be determined by opposite views of human nature and human happiness. Those who, like Plato, think that virtue is an indispensable ingredient of happiness, include honor among the "good things" which the virtuous man will seek in the right way. Possession of good things by itself is not sufficient, Socrates says in the *Euthydemus*. A man must also use them and use them well, for "the wrong use of a thing is far worse than the non-use." Applied to honor, this would seem to mean that the virtuous man will not seek praise for the wrong reasons—either for that which is not praiseworthy in himself or from others whose lack of virtue disqualifies them from giving praise with honesty. The virtuous man will not seek fame or be unhappy lacking it, for fame, like pleasure or wealth, can be enjoyed by bad men as well as good and be sought for wrong as well as right reasons or in the wrong as well as the right way. Virtue, according to the moralists, protects a man from the seductions of money, fame, and power—the things for which men undisciplined by virtue seem to have an inordinate desire.

In the theory of virtue, honor, unlike fame, belongs only to the good and is always a good object, worthy of pursuit. Honor is, in fact, the object of two virtues which Aristotle defines in the *Nicomachean Ethics*. One of these virtues he calls "ambition," and the Greek name for the other, which is literally rendered by "high-mindedness," is sometimes translated by the English word "magnanimity" and sometimes by "pride." The Christian connotation of "pride" makes it a difficult word to use as the name for a virtue, but it can nevertheless be so used when it is understood to mean a justifiable degree of self-respect—not conceit but a middle ground between undue self-esteem and inordinate self-deprecation. When the Aristotelian names for these two vices are translated in English by "vanity" and "humility," it is again necessary to point out that

"humility" must be understood, not in its Christian significance as meaning the virtue of the truly religious man, but rather as signifying an exaggerated meekness or pusillanimity.

The difference between pride and ambition lies in the magnitude of the other virtues they accompany and the scale of honor with which they are concerned. Both are concerned with honor, which Aristotle calls "the greatest of external goods." In both cases, "honor is the prize of virtue, and it is to the good that it is rendered." The proud man is one "who, being truly worthy of great things, also thinks himself worthy of them; for he who does so beyond his deserts is a fool, but no virtuous man is foolish or silly." The proud man will be pleased "only by honors that are great and that are conferred by good men . . . Honor from casual people and on trifling grounds, he will utterly despise, since it is not this that he deserves."

Humility and vanity are, according to Aristotle, the vices of defect and excess which occur when a man fails to be proud. The unduly humble man, underestimating his worth, does not seek the honor he deserves. The vain man, at the other extreme, overestimates himself and wants honor out of proportion to his qualities. Honor, like any other external good, "may be desired more than is right, or less, or from the right sources and in the right way. We blame both the over-ambitious man as aiming at honor more than is right and from the wrong sources, and the unambitious man as not willing to be honored even for noble reasons."

However words are used, the point seems to be clear. It is possible for men to desire honor more than they should and less. It is also possible for honor to be rightly desired. Honor desired to excess or in the wrong way may be called "fame," even as the excessive desire for honor is sometimes regarded as the vice of ambition or an aspect of the sin of pride. The word "pride" seems to have both a good and a bad connotation. But the point remains that the difference between these two meanings of "pride," like the difference between honor and fame, is understood by moralists in terms of virtue, and it is discounted by those who reject the relevance of virtue.

Sociologists, and philosophers who are sociological in their approach, such as Nietzsche, take a different view. According to Weber, "the place of 'status groups' is within the social order, that is, within the sphere of the distribution of 'honor.'" In his view a "status situation" is one "that is determined by a specific, positive or negative, social estimation of honor. This honor may be connected with any quality shared by a plurality, and, of course, it can be knit to a class situation." In another place, Weber explains that by "status situation" he means "the probability of certain social groups' receiving positive or negative social honor. The chances of attaining social honor are primarily determined by differences in the *styles of life* of these groups, hence chiefly by differences of *education*."

THOUGH HONOR MAY be regarded as inseparable from virtue in moral theory, certain political philosophers make its separation from virtue the principle of a type of government.

In Plato's *The Republic*, monarchy and aristocracy are defined in terms of the virtue of the rulers—either of the one wise man or of the excellent few. Government by the few is oligarchy rather than aristocracy when wealth rather than virtue is the principle of their selection. Plato sees the possibility of an intermediate between these two which occurs as a kind of transitional form when aristocracy tends to degenerate into oligarchy. He calls that intermediate "timocracy" and describes it as "a mixture of good and evil" in which the ruler is "a lover of power and a lover of honor, claiming to be a ruler, not because he is eloquent, or on any ground of that sort, but because he is a soldier and has performed feats of arms." In such a state, he claims, "one thing, and one thing only, is predominantly seen—the spirit of contention and ambition; and these are due to the prevalence of the passionate or spirited element." In a timocracy, in other words, honor is divorced from virtue and wisdom and becomes the only qualification for public office.

With Montesquieu, the situation is quite reversed. For him, virtue is absolutely requisite in popular government or democracy, and to

a less extent in that other form of republic which he calls "aristocracy." As virtue is necessary in a republic, so is honor in a monarchy. "Honor—that is, the prejudice of every person and rank—supplies the place of political virtue. A monarchical government supposes pre-eminences and ranks, as likewise a noble descent. Since it is the nature of honor to aspire to preferments and titles, it properly placed in this government."

Though Montesquieu and Plato differ in their classification of the forms of government, they seem to agree that honor divorced from virtue is a counterfeit. Honor identified with ranks and titles, honor which moves individuals to serve the public good in order to promote their own interests, Montesquieu admits is a false honor, "but even this false honor is as useful to the public as true honor could possibly be to private persons." Considering the laws of education characteristic of monarchical governments, Montesquieu points out that it is not in colleges or academies, but in the world itself, which is the school of honor, that the subjects of monarchy are chiefly trained. "Here the actions of men are judged, not as virtuous, but as shining; not as just, but as great; not as reasonable, but extraordinary."

HEROISM IS DISCUSSED in the chapter on COURAGE, and the role of the hero—the leader or great man—in the chapter on HISTORY. Here we are concerned with the hero in the esteem of his fellowmen, the symbol of human greatness and the object of human admiration.

Honor, fame, and glory combine in various proportions to constitute the heroic figures of classical antiquity: honor, to the extent that none is without some virtue and each possesses certain virtues at least to a remarkable degree; fame, because they are the great among men, outstanding and well-known, godlike in their preeminence; and glory, almost in the theological sense, inasmuch as the heroes celebrated by Homer and Virgil are beloved by the gods.

It is not accidental that the central figure in the Greek tragedies is called a "hero," since in the ancient view the tragic character must necessarily belong to a great man, a man of noble

proportions, one who is "better than the ordinary man," says Aristotle. If he also has some fault or flaw, it is a consequence of strength misused, not a mark of individual weakness. Such weakness as he has is the common frailty of man.

In the modern world heroism and the heroic are more difficult to identify or define. We tend to substitute the notion of genius in considering the exceptionally gifted among men. Glory is dimly recognized and honor takes second place to fame. That portion of modern poetry which deals in heroes—as, for example, the tragedies and historical plays of Shakespeare—borrows them from, or models them on, legendary figures. The great modern novels, counterparts of the epic poems of antiquity, portray exceptional men and women without idealizing them to heroic stature. One of these novels, Tolstoy's *War and Peace*, seeks to deflate the fame of great men. They do not deserve even their reputation for great deeds, much less the honor owed the truly great.

"If we assume as historians do that great men lead humanity to the attainment of certain ends . . . then it is impossible," Tolstoy declares, "to explain the facts of history without introducing the conceptions of *chance* and *genius*." But in Tolstoy's opinion "the words *chance* and *genius* do not denote any really existing thing and therefore cannot be defined." We can dispense with these meaningless words, he thinks, if we are willing to renounce "our claim to discern a purpose immediately intelligible to us" and admit "the ultimate purpose to be beyond our ken." Then "not only shall we have no need to see exceptional ability in Napoleon and Alexander, but we shall be unable to consider them to be anything but like ordinary men, and we shall not be obliged to have recourse to *chance* for an explanation of those small events which made these people what they were, but it will be clear that all those small events were inevitable."

This view of history, with its emphasis on impersonal forces, finds another expression in Marxist theory. The machine and the proletariat mass are the heroes of history, or of the revolution. Yet the modern period is not with-

out an opposite strain of thought. Machiavelli calls for a great man, a hero, to become the "liberator" of Italy, "who shall yet heal her wounds and put an end to the ravaging and plundering of Lombardy, to the swindling and taxing of the kingdom and of Tuscany, and cleanse those sores that for long have festered." His maxims for the prince may be read, not merely as advice for getting and holding power, but as preparing for a heroic effort in which the prince's power and fame will be used for liberty. The great man has the historic mission of a pioneer, not the role of a puppet.

Even in the Renaissance, however, Machiavelli is answered by Montaigne, who prizes moderation too much to praise heroism more than a little. Comparing Socrates and Alexander, Montaigne places all of the latter's actions under the maxim, "Subdue the world," whereas Socrates, he says, acts on the principle that it is wise to "lead the life of man in conformity with its natural condition." To Montaigne, "The value of the soul consists not in flying high, but in an orderly pace. Its greatness is exercised not in greatness, but in mediocrity."

The medieval Christian conception of heroism centers on the practice of heroic virtue, by which the theologian defines sanctity. In the calendar of saints, there is every type of spiritual excellence, but all alike—martyrs, virgins, confessors, doctors—are regarded as having, with God's grace, superhuman strength. The saints not only perform acts of exemplary perfection; they are godlike men in their exemption from the frailties of human flesh.

The heroes of antiquity also wear an aspect of divinity, but, like Achilles, each has a weakness in his armor. Moreover, the heroes of *The Iliad*, *The Odyssey*, and *The Aeneid* are men of overweening pride. They are relentlessly jealous of their honor. They strive not so much for victory as for the due meed of honor which is its fruit. Nothing grieves them so much as to have their deeds go unrequited by abundant praise. In the contribution made by this love of praise to the growth of the Roman empire, Augustine sees the providential working of God. In order that that empire "might overcome the grievous evils which ex-

isted among other nations," he writes, God "purposely granted it to such men as, for the sake of honor, and praise, and glory, consulted well for their country, in whose glory they sought their own, and whose safety they did not hesitate to prefer to their own, suppressing the desire of wealth and many other vices for this one vice, namely, the love of praise."

To Augustine, however, this glory found in human praise is far removed from the true glory. It is, in fact, a sin. "So hostile is this vice to pious faith," he writes, "if the love of glory be greater in the heart than the fear or love of God, that the Lord said, 'How can ye believe, who look for glory from one another, and do not seek the glory which is from God alone?'"

The Christian hero, consequently, seeks not his own glory, but the glory of God, and in contrast to the pagan hero, he is great, not in pride, but in humility. His model is seen in the Apostles, who, according to Augustine, "amidst maledictions and reproaches, and most grievous persecutions and cruel punishments, were not deterred from the preaching of human salvation. And when . . . great glory followed them in the church of Christ, they did not rest in that as in the end of their virtue, but referred that glory itself to the glory of God . . . For their Master had taught them not to seek to be good for the sake of human glory, saying, 'Take heed that ye do not your righteousness before men to be seen of them' . . . but 'Let your works shine before men, that they may see your good deeds, and glorify your Father who is in heaven.'"

The word "glory" in its theological connotation thus has a meaning distinct from, and even opposed to, the sense in which it is sometimes used as a synonym for "fame." In the liturgy of the church, the psalms and hymns (especially those of the doxology which sing the *gloria Patri* and the *gloria in excelsis Deo*) render unto God the homage which is due His infinite goodness, the reflexive splendor of which is the divine glory. As in the strict moral sense honor on the human plane is due to virtue alone, so in a strict theological sense glory belongs only to God.

Strictly, God's glory cannot be increased by human recognition. Yet every act of religious

devotion is said to redound to the greater glory of God and to diffuse His glory among creatures through the divinity they acquire when they love God and are beloved by Him. God is "all fullness and the acme of all perfection"; nevertheless, Montaigne writes, "his name may grow and increase by the blessing and praise we give to his external works."

According to Dante, "The glory of the All-Mover penetrates through the universe and re-

glows in one part more, and in another less." In his journey through Paradise, he beholds the saints whom God loves especially, each with a distinct degree of glory according to the proximity with which he approaches the presence of God. Their halos and aureoles, in the imagery of Christian art, are the symbols of the glory in which they are bathed as in reflected light.