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| **Meeting title:** The concept of grounding in contemporary philosophy |
| **Date:** 4.7.2024.  |
| **Time:** 18.00 |
| **Place:** Zoom |
| **Zoom link:** Odsjek za filozofiju Filozofski fakultet u Rijeci is inviting you to a scheduled Zoom meeting. Topic: Odsjek za filozofiju Filozofski fakultet u Rijeci's Zoom MeetingTime: Jul 4, 2024 05:30 PM Europe/Zagreb Join Zoom Meeting<https://us02web.zoom.us/j/89928780764?pwd=2SwLNJLWAj65Sf3Mnuk9lIFEEKf7MC.1> Meeting ID: 899 2878 0764Passcode: 88208 |
| **Duration:** 2 hours |
| **Participants:** Miloš Panajotov, Boran Berčić, Filip Čeč, Andrej Jandrić, Matija Rajter, Vito Balorda, Ema Lalić |
| **Agenda:**1. Miloš Panajotov delivered the lecture “The concept of grounding in contemporary philosophy”
2. Discussion, questions and comments
 |
| **Meeting summary:** On Thursday 4.7.2024. the team of the MetPhil project gathered to listen to the talk of Miloš Panajotov titled “The concept of grounding in contemporary philosophy”. In the first part of the talk Panajotov presented the results of his research concerning the concept of ‘grounding’. The team of the MetPhil project then presented their questions and comments regarding the content of the research. |
| **Talk summary:**Panajotov gave an overview of the contemporary discussion regarding the concept of ‘grounding’. He presented the most commonly held positions along with some criticism of the concept of ‘grounding’ and his response to the latter. There are some common notions associated with the concept of ‘grounding’, for instance the claim that it is a primitive term and that we can contrast it with the term of ‘causation’. The concept of ‘grounding’ has the following formal-logical properties: non-reflexivity, non-symmetricity and transitivity. There are two approaches towards understanding the concept of ‘grounding’: unionism and separatism. Unionism understands ‘ground’ as essentially being a form of metaphysical explanation. Separatism, on the other hand, deny this claim.The trinity of the most important contemporary works regarding the notion of ‘grounding’ are “The Question of Realism” (Kit Fine 2001), “On What Grounds What” (Jonathan Schaffer) and “Metaphysical Dependence: Grounding and Reduction” (Gideon Rosen 2010).Panajotov represents the thesis of eliminativism regarding grounding which goes as follows: we should eliminate the concept of grounding from metaphysical discourse on the basis of reason *x*. There are two prongs to the skeptics criticism: the claim that (1) Grounding is not an understandable concept and (2) Grounding is a redundant concept.There are three ways in which we can specify the content of the concept of ‘grounding’:1. State the logical properties of the concept;
2. Consider the relationship between ‘grounding’ and other familiar concepts;
3. Giving examples

Questions and CommentsBerčić* Gives the example of the Marxist notion of base and superstructure as an example of a grounding relation and comments further on this example. But it looks like this would still be also a causal relation that is persistent through time.
* The examples that are usually given to support grounding are not adequate. It looks like there is a lack of unity among the examples.

Balorda* Question regarding Euthyphro’s dilemma: it looks Panajotov mentions that only the grounding relation is present in the dilemma. Can the author explain this relationship? Is there any causality present?

Čeč* It seems to him that the concept of ‘grounding’ really could be redundant. What is the *differentia specifica* of ‘grounding’?
* Where can we find the relation of grounding in the given examples? He agrees with Berčić that we can explain these examples by way of other relations without mentioning grounding.
* Comment on the idea that we should look at ‘grounding’ as an umbrella term.

Jandrić* Clarificatory comment regarding small-g grounding relations; these should not pose a threat to the big-G idea of Grounding.
* Comments on the applicability of the concept of ‘grounding’ in the context of the discussion of Humeanism about natural laws.
* Comment on the difference between causality and grounding concerning synchronicity.

Rajter* Panajotov responds to one line of criticism towards grounding in the following way: the metaphysicians are not forced to choose between Grounding and small-g grounding. Is this, however, really an adequate response to the criticism?
* What position is currently the mainstream view regarding contemporary discussion about grounding, Unionism or Separatism?
* Can we view big-G Grounding as an overarching category or set within which we find small-g grounding relations? Can this help us with answering the lack of unity challenge concerning grounding?
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