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| **Meeting title:** How to do Philosophy with Aristotle: An Example |
| **Date:** 19.12.2024. |
| **Time:** 18.00 |
| **Place:** Zoom |
| **Zoom link:**  Join Zoom Meeting <https://us02web.zoom.us/j/84716627392?pwd=9Yh3K6DBCbP4PfExnub7J8zpNPejxX.1>  Meeting ID: 847 1662 7392 Passcode: 531082 |
| **Duration:** 1 hour and 30 minutes |
| **Participants:** Boran Berčić, Mark Balaguer, Justin Weinberg, Vito Balorda, Matija Rajter, Danica Radoš, Filip Grgić, Filip Čeč, Ljudevit Hanžek, Ana Gavran Miloš |
| **Agenda:**   1. Filip Grgić delivered the lecture “How to do Philosophy with Aristotle: An Example” 2. Discussion, questions and comments |
| **Meeting summary:**  On Thursday 19.12.2024. the team of the MetPhil project gathered to listen to the talk of Filip Grgić titled “How to do Philosophy with Aristotle: An Example”. In the first part of the talk Grgić gave an outline of the philosophical methodology employed by Aristotle by way of a case study in which he analyzed particular excerpts of Aristotle. The second part of the workshop was dedicated to questions and comments that the members of the MetPhil project directed at the content of the talk. |
| **Talk summary:**  In this talk Grgić tried to present interesting metaphilosophical themes that are to be found in Aristotle. For such purposes Grgić selected Chapter 1 of Book 8 of Aristotle's *Eudemian Ethics* and offered a reconstruction of his arguments. On the basis of such an reconstruction Grgić wanted to show three things.  First, he wanted to use this passage as an example to show how Aristotle himself is doing philosophy (an analysis that is often overlooked when studying Aristotle).  Second, he wants to highlight what *we* need to keep in mind while studying Aristotle. What he wants to show is how much detail is needed to study Aristotle properly.  Third, he wants to show the assumptions underlying the Aristotelian approach to philosophy because it is more complex than it seems at first hand. The problem lies in the following: (1) The more we dig into the details, the less clear it becomes what Aristotle's position actually is, and (2) The more we dig into the details, the more it becomes apparent that our concepts are not the same as Aristotle's.  This raises a broader question: what is the point of doing history of philosophy? Grgić does not think there is a single answer to this question, but he thinks that Bernard Williams' view is relevant: when you do history of philosophy, you should do both history and philosophy. Also, the point of philosophy is to „make the familiar seem strange.”  Questions and Comments  **Balaguer**   * Thoughts about why the argument seems weird. For most of us the reaction we have against the Socratic view is because we think knowledge is an internal state, while being just is heavily defined in terms of how we act. So intuitively it seems that we can know what is just but consistently do the unjust thing because acting justly or unjustly is heavily defined in terms of how we act.   **Weinberg**   * Certainly I can prescribe the wrong type of medicine even if I don’t know what the right type of medicine is. This is connected to the claim that you cannot produce the opposite of knowledge without having knowledge. * Does the author want to hear critiques about Aristotle’s argument, or is he more interested into the methodological part of Aristotle? Do we seek insights into the argument or into the methodology? * Another issue with the argument is the following: we are using the same words for properties of actions and properties of agents. If we talk about unjust an act and an unjust person it is not clear that we are talking about the same property etc. Maybe there is some form of equivocation going on here?   **Berčić**   * It seems to him that Aristotle is cheating in his argument, in his analysis that knowledge and virtue are two side Aristotle can go further with his analysis than that. * Proposition 4 – he thinks that this one is wrong and it seems to him that here we can see the equivocation of the two senses of ‘two sided’ that appears in the Aristotle text. * The thesis of assymetry reminds him of Susan Wolff   **Rajter**   * In the context of Text 4 Grgić mentioned that he does not really believe that practical wisdom can determine the direction in which knowledge will be actualized. Is this really the case? |
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