

**ARISTOTLE**

Philosophy 452 = Classics 452  
Spring 2006  
Tuesday-Thursday, 1:00-2:30  
Prince 211

Eric Brown  
Busch 105  
Thursdays, 2:30-4:00,  
and by appointment  
935-4257  
eabrown@wustl.edu

***Description***

This course offers a maximally full, detailed introduction to the works of Aristotle. His logic, natural philosophy, psychology, metaphysics, ethics, and political philosophy will be discussed, and stress will be laid on the interpretive problems facing contemporary philosophers seeking to understand Aristotle's achievement.

This semester, we will concentrate in the first half of the course on the basic concepts of Aristotelian ontology and natural philosophy: substance, form, end, and essence. The aim will be to understand Aristotelian teleology and Aristotelian metaphysics with an eye toward their current plausibility. In the second half of the course, we will turn to Aristotle's ethics and politics. Again, a few concepts will be front and center: the good, happiness or success, virtue, friendship, and political animal. The aim will be to understand the fundamental structure of Aristotle's ethical theory and its essentially political nature, again with an eye toward current plausibility.

There will be two colloquia in the philosophy department this winter that tackle Aristotle's natural philosophy. Christopher Mirus will speak on Thursday, 19 January, at 4:15, and Devin Henry will speak on Thursday, 9 February at 4:15. Everyone is especially encouraged to attend these talks.

***Prerequisites***

This class is an in-depth survey, designed primarily to give graduate students in philosophy a broad introduction to Aristotle's philosophical achievement.

Officially, it is open to graduate students in other fields and to undergraduates who have completed at least one philosophy class at the 300-level (or its equivalent at another university) and at least two philosophy courses overall. The official prerequisites are not as important as the informal ones, however. Simply put, it will be difficult to keep up with this course if one does not have (1) some comfortable acquaintance with philosophy, (2) some comfortable acquaintance with Aristotle, and (3) a significant amount of time in which to study the required readings.

Any student who has done well in my 300-level survey of ancient philosophy should have the necessary comfort-level with philosophy and with Plato, and other routes to the informal prerequisites are possible. But these requirements should be taken seriously. It is possible to overcome some deficit in one's philosophical background or one's past experience with Aristotle, but this will require extra reading and re-reading, which will require still more time.

### ***Grades and Requirements***

A. Participation. Because the class is designed to provide an advanced survey of Plato, the instructor will do a lot of talking to cover an extensive amount of ground. But he expects to be interrupted with questions at any moment, and will be disappointed if he is not interrupted. All students are expected to be ready and willing to participate when discussion breaks out. (bonus points at instructor's discretion)

B. Writing. There are two options.

(1) Two short papers (maximum 2500 words each, excluding notes), one due at noon on Monday, 20 March, and the other due at noon on Wednesday, 3 May. The papers should be submitted as e-mail attachments, and they should include a word count. Students are free to write on a topic of their own choosing, so long as that topic was clearly raised in class or is approved by the instructor. (100 points each)

(2) One longer, research paper (maximum 7500 words, excluding notes), due at noon on Friday, 5 May. As a research paper, this is expected to take account of the literature in the field. (200 points)

The second option is available only by petition, and petitions are due by March 3. If you are interested, express your interest to me in writing by then. (An email is fine.)

C. Exam. There will be a final exam to test for acquaintance with Aristotle's philosophical achievement. The test will consist of identifying ten of twelve short passages from readings assigned in this course. Identifications must explain what is being said, the significance of what is being said to the work, and the broader significance of what is being said to Aristotle's philosophical achievement. The last of these three desiderata requires situating the view expressed in the passage in relation to some philosophical question of enduring interest and in relation to some other answer to the question or some other reasoning for the same answer. (100 points)

The deadlines are firm, and tardiness will be penalized by ten points per twenty-four hours or fraction thereof. An incomplete for additional work on a research paper is available by a written petition that specifies a new deadline, but the standards for papers handed in later will be significantly higher.

It should not be necessary to say, but all work submitted for credit in this class must be the student's own and written for this particular class. If ideas or words are borrowed without attribution from another person or are borrowed from work done for another class, or if there is any other violation of the academic integrity policy printed in the course listings, the student will automatically fail the course and be referred to the committee on academic integrity.

### ***Texts***

The campus bookstore in Mallinckrodt has the two-volume complete works of Aristotle in the Revised Oxford Translation. I very much prefer that we all use this same edition in the course. It is not inexpensive, but everyone seriously interested in philosophy should own the complete works of Aristotle.

On the syllabus, I strongly suggest the starred secondary readings, each of which will be made available in one of three ways.

Some I will make available in class or as email attachments.

You must regularly check the mail sent to the address in your WebSTAC account, and if you are auditing the class without officially enrolling, please email me at the start of the semester to be added to a distribution list.

Others are already available via JSTOR (<http://www.jstor.org/search/>).

For JSTOR access, you need to be using an on-campus computer, or you need to use the library's server as a proxy, for which see <http://library.wustl.edu/about/proxy.html>.

The rest will be available through Olin's E-Res, at <http://eres.wustl.edu/>.

To navigate this site, you will need the name of the instructor or course, and you will need the password that will be announced in class and distributed by email.

For all of these electronic documents, you need Adobe Acrobat Reader (a free download from [www.adobe.com](http://www.adobe.com)) or some other software for displaying and printing pdf files (e.g., Preview in Mac OS X).

Students who do not read Greek are encouraged to look at multiple translations for passages that seem confusing or are obviously touchy, and are required to look at multiple translations for any passages that they discuss in detail in their papers, to ensure that they are not relying on an idiosyncratic translation. The library and used bookstores and the web are filled with alternative translations. Among the most convenient are

Ackrill, ed. [A New Aristotle Reader](#). Princeton University Press.

A reader culled from the Clarendon Aristotle series and other new translations. Not comprehensive enough for serious use, but it does have some helpful suggestions for further reading and such.

Irwin and Fine, trans. and ed. [Aristotle: Selections](#). Hackett.

An excellent set of selections rendered with great consistency but unfortunate quirkiness by a husband-wife team, and accompanied by helpful glossary and index. There is also an abridgment of this, entitled [Aristotle: Introductory Readings](#).

McKeon, ed. [The Basic Works of Aristotle](#). Random House.

A broader reader than Ackrill's, culled from the original Oxford Translation, which is a bit old-fashioned and interpretative. Easily found in used bookstores, and still in print.

(various translators, various works). Clarendon Aristotle Series.

This is an excellent series, with translations well-suited for serious philosophical work and with generally strong commentaries.

(various translators, various works). Loeb Classical Library.

The individual volumes in this series boast Greek on the facing page, but the translations are generally unreliable and the Greek uncritical. Two exceptions: [De Caelo](#) and the biological works.

Apostle, trans. (various works).

I've no opinion of these translations.

There are several good introductions to Aristotle that some students might find helpful. Here are some to consider:

Ackrill, J.L. [Aristotle the Philosopher](#). Oxford.

A short and clear introduction that connects Aristotle to the philosophical preoccupations of Oxford philosophy in the 50s and 60s.

Barnes, J. [Aristotle](#). Oxford.

Very engagingly written, this small book shows quite a lot of attention to biographical detail and to Aristotle's work as a biologist. (In the latter way, it is akin to Marjorie Grene's [Aristotle](#).)

Code, A. [Aristotle](#). Westview.

I don't believe that this is yet in print, but keep it in mind for future reference. I believe Code to be the best scholar of Aristotle of his generation.

Lear, J. Aristotle: The Desire to Understand. Cambridge.

This is a fine introduction, though it proceeds by considering in some depth just a few topics.

Ross, W.D. Aristotle. Routledge.

This is a classic handbook, which summarizes what Aristotle says throughout the corpus. Sir David's reading represents in many respects the traditional interpretation that has in some details been overturned in recent decades, but it can never be dismissed lightly.

Those looking for more secondary literature (e.g., those doing research papers) should follow the citations in the sources I suggest in the syllabus below, should check recent numbers of L'Année Philologique and The Philosopher's Index, and should consult the excellent bibliographies in

Barnes et al., eds. Articles on Aristotle. 4 vols. Duckworth.

Barnes, ed. The Cambridge Companion to Aristotle. Cambridge.

### ***Note for Readers of Greek***

If there is interest, I will be happy to meet once a week to read (in Greek) and discuss (in English) a short passage of that week's required reading. I will make available photocopies of the selected passage each week.

### ***Suggestions for Reading***

Aristotle's writing is much too dense to be read casually. Even in the context of philosophical writing, Aristotle's is difficult.

In my lectures, I will generally try to spiral into the day's selection. I will start by situating it in the broader context of Aristotle's corpus, and I will proceed by offering a general characterization of its main thesis or theses. Where there is controversy about the situation or thesis of the passage, which is virtually everywhere, I will make these steps by lay out the contending interpretations. Then I will offer a coarse outline of the reading (or, in the case of Metaphysics Zeta, the competing coarse outlines), before I turn to progressively finer outlines that highlight the arguments that are most important to the interpretive controversy and especially (where these are not the same) the arguments that are most significant for assessing Aristotle's position.

I suggest that everyone read with a similar strategy in mind. Start by working through the whole selection, with some glances to its broader context. Note that Aristotle frequently buries his main point at the end of a chapter, or even the end of a series of chapters. That is why you need to read through the whole selection to figure out what he is trying to do. Once you have figured out what he is trying to do, work through the selection again to see how he gets there. Start by reading through a bit more slowly to establish a coarse outline of the whole selection, and read once more, painstakingly, trying to fill in each part of the outline and account for every sentence.

Collect your questions as you do this. Where do there seem to be gaps or inconsistencies? One of these would make for a terrific short essay.

If you are entirely lost, Ross' summaries in his introduction to Aristotle (mentioned above) will provide one reasonable reading for you to cling to. So will the strongly suggested secondary reading. If you have a lead on what Aristotle is up to, you are ready to see some problems. In the syllabus below, I have cited other secondary sources that highlight some of the interpretive controversies and/or develop the philosophical significance of Aristotle's discussion. Feel free to explore.

### **Syllabus**

In-depth study of starred readings from Aristotle is required; unstarred readings from Aristotle are suggested but not required.

Starred (\*) secondary sources are strongly suggested—each of these will be available by email, E-Res, or JSTOR (for which see above)—and unstarred secondary sources are listed for those looking to explore further. See the suggestions above for still more research possibilities.

NB: I have not put material on reserve, but I hope that no one will take material on Aristotle out of the library.

Please, for the sake of the rest of us, return all such material to the shelves after photocopying or reading.

Jan 17 Introduction

unassigned Deductive Argument (Syllogistic)

One of Aristotle's signal contributions is the invention of formal logic as an autonomous subject of inquiry. For some introduction to the project, see [Prior Analytics I 1-2, I 4-7, I 30](#)

The core of Aristotle's logic is the syllogism, on which see the classic studies

Kapp, "Syllogistic," in [Articles on Aristotle](#), vol. 1

Lukasiewicz, [Aristotle's Syllogistic](#)

Patzig, [Aristotle's Theory of the Syllogism](#)

One question concerning Aristotle's syllogistic is its scope. On this, see Mueller, "Stoic and Peripatetic Logic," [Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie](#) 51 (1969): 173-187.

A discussion of metalogic can be found in

Lear, [Aristotle and Logical Theory](#)

For more detailed bibliographies on various topics in Aristotle's logic other than syllogistic, see especially the bibliography in [The Cambridge Companion to Aristotle](#).

Jan 19 Metaphilosophy: Dialectic and the "Endoxic Method"

For orientation, we seek Aristotle's conception of how argument should and should not proceed and of how he does philosophy.

\* [Topics I 1-3](#)

\* [Sophistical Refutations 1-2](#)

\* [Prior Analytics I 30](#)

\* [Nicomachean Ethics I 3 1094b11-27](#)

\* [Nicomachean Ethics VII 1 1145b2-7](#)

\* [Nicomachean Ethics I 4 1095a28-30](#)

\* [Metaphysics B \(III\) 1 995a24-b4](#)

\* [Metaphysics G \(IV\) 2 1004b17-26](#)

The best account of Aristotle's approach to dialectic is

E. Stump, "Dialectic and Aristotle's Topics," in Dialectic and the Development of Medieval Logic

An enormously influential piece on Aristotelian method is

Owen, "*Tithenai ta Phainomena*," in Aristote et les problèmes de méthode, ed. S. Mansion, reprinted in Articles on Aristotle, vol. 1, reprinted in Logic, Science, and Dialectic

Contrasting reactions to Owen can be found in

Nussbaum, The Fragility of Goodness, chp. 8

Irwin, "Ways to First Principles: Aristotle's Methods of Discovery," Philosophical Topics 15 (1987): 109-134.

The epistemological difficulties facing the Aristotelian method are squarely tackled in

Irwin, Aristotle's First Principles, sections 94-95.

Włodarczyk. "Aristotelian Dialectic and the Discovery of Truth." Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy 18: 153-210.

## Jan 19 **Philosophy Colloquium on Aristotle at 4:15**

### Jan 24 The Elements of Dialectic

Once one is clear about the kinds of argument Aristotle formalizes for use in developing science and in particular philosophical science, one needs to inquire into the premises for such arguments. One place to begin is with Aristotle's belief that any dialectical inquiry is built out of four elements:

\* Topics I 4-5

For discussion, see

Hadgopoulos, "Protasis and Problema in the Topics," Phronesis 21 (1976): 266-276

For further information on definitions, see especially

Topics VI

Posterior Analytics II

with the far-ranging discussion of

LeBlond, "Aristotle on Definition," in Articles on Aristotle, vol. 3 Behind the "predicables" lies an account of "predication." The bulk of De Interpretatione concerns predication. For a taste, see

\* De Interpretatione 1-4

Two discussions to seek out:

\* Moravcsik, "Aristotle on predication," Philosophical Review 76 (1967): 80-97.

Code, "On the origin of Aristotle's theory of predication," in How Things Are, ed. Bogen and McGuire

A few brief remarks in De Interpretatione are said to provide Aristotle's theory of language and meaning. On this, see especially:

Kretzmann, "Aristotle on spoken sound significant by convention," in Ancient Logic and its Modern Interpretations, ed. Corcoran.

Modrak, Aristotle's Theory of Language and Meaning

### Jan 26 Categories

Aristotle links his four "predicables" with ten "kinds of predicate" in

\* Topics I 9

This same list of ten kinds of predicate (categories) is developed and discussed in

\* Categories 1-5

See also

\* Posterior Analytics I 22

The Categories is a strange and problematic work, however. An important discussion of its problems is

Frede, "The Title, Unity, and Authenticity of Aristotle's Categories," in Essays in Ancient Philosophy

Frede believes that the Categories is not actually about the categories, and so he talks about the categories by discussing the Topics:

Frede, "Categories in Aristotle," in Essays in Ancient Philosophy  
A different account is provided by

Mansion, "Notes sur la doctrine des catégories dans les Topiques," in Aristotle on Dialectic, ed. Owen

Regardless of how the "categories" of the Topics and the Categories relate, we might wonder about the potential significance of them. Reflect on the doctrine of homonymy and

\* Metaphysics V 7 1017a23-30

This anticipates a bit, but if you are interested in seeing how this application of the categories is problematic and how this problem might be solvable, see

Owen, "Logic and metaphysics in some early works of Aristotle," reprinted in Articles on Aristotle, vol. 3, reprinted in Logic, Science, and Dialectic

The best overview of Aristotelian logic and metaphysics is  
Code, in Routledge history

If we want to get clearer on what the Categories itself says, we should want to appreciate four matters. First is the distinction between substance and non-substance categories.

Second is the account of how non-substance kinds of predication say that things are in a subject:

Ackrill, Aristotle: Categories and De Interpretatione, ad 1a20

Owen, "Inherence," Phronesis 10 (1965): 97-105. reprinted in Logic, Science, and Dialectic

Frede, "Individuals in Aristotle," in Essays in Ancient Philosophy, esp. 50-63.

Third is the distinction between genera said of a subject, and individuals not said of a subject. Does this help our understanding of the predicable "genus?"

Fourth is the account of substance in Categories 5, on which

Dancy, "On some of Aristotle's first thoughts about substances," Philosophical Review 84 (1975): 338-373.

Aristotle's thoughts on substance in the Categories seem inextricably bound to his reflection on Plato. But views about his relation to Plato are mixed:

Ross, "The Development of Aristotle's Thought," Proceedings of the British Academy 43 (1957): 63-78, reprinted in Articles on Aristotle, vol. 1

Owen, "The Platonism of Aristotle," Proceedings of the British Academy 51 (1966): 125-150, reprinted in Articles in Aristotle, vol. 1, reprinted in Logic, Science, and Dialectic.

Mann, The Discovery of Things

At the center of Aristotle's relation to Plato is Aristotle's essay Peri Ideon (On Ideas), of which we have only an extract saved by Alexander of Aphrodisias. If you are interested, the place to look is

Fine, On Ideas

unassigned Modality

The last few chapters of De Interpretatione concern modality. First, there is a famous discussion of future contingents:

De Interpretatione 6, 7, and 9

The literature on this argument is astonishingly large. Here's a relatively recent discussion:

Bäck, "Sailing through the Sea-Battle," Ancient Philosophy 12 (1992): 133-151

For some important recent discussions of these topics, see

Bradley, "Must the Future be what it is going to be?" Mind ns 68 (1959): 193-208.

Taylor, "Fatalism," Philosophical Review 71 (1962): 56-66.

And much more recent:

MacFarlane, "Future Contingents and Relative Truth," The Philosophical Quarterly 53 (2003): 321-336.

More general discussion of modality comes in

De Interpretatione 12-13

A very influential analysis can be found in

Hintikka, "Aristotle on the realization of possibilities in time," in Articles on Aristotle, vol. 3

Jan 31

Deductive Science

After following Aristotle's account of deductive arguments in general and then pursuing his account of dialectic, we need to look to his account of demonstration. Here our text is the Posterior Analytics, which presents a theory of demonstration as a "philosophy of science." There are some excellent volumes devoted to this work. Two commentaries:

Ross, Aristotle: Prior and Posterior Analytics

Barnes, Aristotle: Posterior Analytics

A collection of articles:

Berti, ed. Aristotle on Science.

And several monographs:

Ferejohn, The Origins of Aristotelian Science

McKirahan, Principles and Proofs

For contrasting assessments of what Aristotle is generally up to in the Posterior Analytics and how it fits (or fails to fit) what he says elsewhere about science or knowledge, see

van Fraassen, "A Re-examination of Aristotle's Philosophy of Science," Dialogue 19 (1980): 20-45.

Taylor, "Aristotle's Epistemology," in Companions to Ancient Thought-1: Epistemology, ed. Everson

We shall not have time to investigate everything here, but there are several topics of great interest. First is the conception of "science" or understanding:

\* Posterior Analytics I 1-3

\* Metaphysics D (V) 1

For discussion of Aristotle's conception of science, see

Burnyeat, "Aristotle on understanding knowledge," in Aristotle on Science, ed. Berti

For his account of definition and his essentialism:

\* Posterior Analytics I 4

Next is the actual theory of demonstration, which is the bulk of the work and especially:

Posterior Analytics I 4-8, I 13, II 8-10

Barnes, "Aristotle's Theory of Demonstration," Phronesis 14 (1969): 123-152, reprinted in Articles on Aristotle, vol. 1

Scholz, "The ancient axiomatic theory," in Articles on Aristotle, vol. 1

Among the privileged first principles of scientific demonstration are definitions, and the bulk of Posterior Analytics II concerns definitions, which we have already examined under the predicables. The third topic of interest to the Posterior Analytics is the account of how we discover the first principles:

\* Posterior Analytics II 19

This should be compared with the above discussions of dialectic and philosophy, and with the following account of induction:

\* Prior Analytics II 23

Dispute over the discovery of first principles has turned on what Aristotle means by "nous." See

\* Ross, Aristotle: Prior and Posterior Analytics, 84-86 (**E-Res**)

\* Barnes, Aristotle: Posterior Analytics, ad II 19 (**E-Res**)

\* Irwin, Aristotle's First Principles, 134-136, 531-532 (**E-Res**)

Feb 2

### The Principles of Change

Change is a fundamental concern of the science of the natural world, since things in the natural world change, in four ways:

\* Physics III 1 200b33-34

Hence, Aristotle is right to begin the Physics by tackling a change. But Aristotle does not make this justification clear until the beginning of Book Two. Book One, by contrast, begins as a discussion of predecessors on the fundamental principles of the cosmos and becomes a discussion of the fundamental principles of all change, natural and otherwise. Read

\* Physics I 1, 5-9

Consult the following two commentaries on Physics I 7 for contrasting accounts:

\* Ross, Aristotle: Physics, 21-23 (**E-Res**)

\* Charlton, Aristotle: Physics Books I and II, ad I 7 (**E-Res**)

There are also valuable studies by

Wieland, "Aristotle's Physics and the Problem of Inquiry into Principles," in Articles on Aristotle, vol. 1

Code, "The Persistence of Aristotelian Matter," Philosophical Studies 29 (1976): 357-367.

Bostock, "Aristotle on the Principles of change in Physics I," in Language and Logos, ed. Schofield and Nussbaum

And if the general notion of matter seems odd, one might consult

Anscombe, "The Principle of Individuation," in Articles on Aristotle, vol. 3

unassigned

### Accounting for Change

Much of Aristotle's physics is dedicated to explaining the fundamental sorts of change. Substantial change (coming-to-be and passing-away, generation and corruption) is the most difficult for him. See especially

On Generation and Corruption I 1-4

This inquiry is for Aristotle inextricably bound to a discussion of the elements, which are basic (though perhaps not most basic) matter for coming-to-be and passing-away. See the discussion of

On Generation and Corruption II 1-4

De Caelo I 1-3

For some debate, see the contrasting views set forth in the Clarendon commentaries of

Williams, Aristotle: On Generation and Corruption

Charlton, Aristotle: Physics Books I and II, appendix

Another excellent commentary is provided by

Joachim, Aristotle on Coming-to-be and Passing-away

Growth is directly discussed only in

On Generation and Corruption I 5

Locomotion is the change most discussed in the Physics itself. See especially

Physics III 1-3, V 1-3

Compare

Metaphysics IX 6 1048b18-34

In connection with these texts, it is useful to contemplate whether Aristotle has a mechanics. See, e.g.,

Owen, "Aristotelian Mechanics," in Logic, Science, and Dialectic

Much of the Physics is dedicated to special topics that are subordinate to the study of motion, including infinity

Physics III 4-8

place

Physics IV 1-5

space and void

Physics IV 6-9

time

Physics IV 10-14

and the puzzles of continuity and divisibility

Physics V

Feb 7

## The Study of Nature

Up until now, we have been pursuing Aristotle's accounts of each kind of change, and have seen what we might call his metaphysical physics. But Aristotle's "physics" is a study of natural things, and the paradigmatic natural things are living things. What is philosophically interesting here is not so much what Aristotle says about living things, but what he says about how living things ought to be studied. Our primary texts are Physics II, which identifies the subject matter of natural philosophy and asks how one ought to study it, and those chapters of the biological writings which self-consciously record how natural philosophy should be done. The first pass on how natural philosophy should be done is:

\* Physics II 1-2

We are back in the first two books of Physics, and so we have available to us the following commentaries:

Ross, Aristotle: Physics

Charlton, Aristotle: Physics Books I and II

The leading discussion of Aristotelian nature is

Waterlow, Nature, Change, and Agency

The student of nature is supposed to give the four causes:

\* Physics II 3 and 7

\* Posterior Analytics II 11

\* Metaphysics A (I) 3

It is frequently said that the four causes are not really causes (on broadly Humean grounds). See Charlton's commentary or, e.g.,

Vlastos, "Reasons and Causes in the Phaedo," in Platonic Studies, esp. 78-81.

For an attack on the broadly Humean presuppositions about causation, see Anscombe, "Causality and Determination," in Causation, ed.

Sosa and Tooley

In addition to the four causes, the student of nature might say that something has happened by chance, or spontaneously. See Aristotle's account in

\* Physics II 4-6

And the short discussion of

Lennox, "Aristotle on chance," Archiv für Geschichte der Philosophie 66 (1984): 52-60

Feb 9

### Natural Teleology

Physics II 1-2 say that the student of nature must study both matter and form but especially the form. The same lesson is repeated in the context of the four causes in Physics II 3-7. But the third time is the charm, for now Aristotle attempts to argue for why the student of nature must examine formal-final causation and how that examination is supposed to fit with an account of material necessity:

\* Physics II 8-9

Along with this discussion, it is extremely valuable to consider Aristotle's appeals to final cause and material necessity in his biological works. See especially

\* Metereologica IV 12

\* De Partibus Animalium I 1

\* De Partibus Animalium II 1

\* De Generatione Animalium V 1 through 778b20

\* De Generatione Animalium V 8

The old-fashioned interpretation considers Aristotle some kind of vitalist, presupposing immaterial entities. More recently, some have said that Aristotelian final causes are artifacts of our epistemic situation and not features of the world. See, for example,

Taylor, "Teleological Explanation—a Reply to Denis Noble," Analysis 27 (1966-1967): 141-143

Nussbaum, Aristotle's De Motu Animalium, 59-99

More recent interpretations have insisted that neither the old orthodoxy nor the epistemicists are right. See especially the essays in Part III of

Gotthelf and Lennox, Philosophical Issues in Aristotle's Biology and

Johnson, Aristotle on Teleology

In addition to the dispute about what teleological explanation is, there is a disagreement about its scope. Old-fashioned interpretations attribute anthropocentric, universal teleology to Aristotle, whereas most contemporary scholars do not. The principal passages have recently been debated by

Sedley, "Is Aristotle's teleology anthropocentric?" Phronesis 36 (1991): 179-196

Wardy, "Aristotelian rainfall or the lore of averages," Phronesis 38 (1993): 18-30

Feb 9

### Philosophy Colloquium on Aristotle at 4:15

Feb 14

### Life

Aristotle introduces the project of De Anima at

\* De Anima I 1 402a1 - I 2 403b27

In the rest of Book I, he tackles his predecessors, but we will concentrate on the more obviously constructive side of Aristotle's project, which begins at the start of Book II. Here Aristotle takes two very different approaches to the account of animation. First he tries to determine what is responsible for animation by using the terms of his metaphysics. Second he analyzes animation into its characteristic activities. See

\* De Anima II 1 412a1 - II 4 415a22

With these chapters, read:

Ackrill, "Aristotle's definitions of psuchê," Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society 76 (1972-1973): 119-133, reprinted in Articles on Aristotle, vol. 4.

Since we are just now turning to De Anima, you should know where to look for further information. Better than Ross' commentary and the Clarendon Aristotle commentary (by Hamlyn), there is

Hicks, Aristotle: De Anima

There is also a valuable introduction in

Aristotle, De Anima (On the Soul), trans. Lawson-Tancred

Some essays are collected in

Durrant, Aristotle's De Anima in Focus

Nussbaum and Rorty, Essays on Aristotle's De Anima

An interesting recent argument in an Aristotelian vein is

Thompson, "The Representation of Life," in Virtues and Reasons, ed. Hursthouse et al.

Feb 16

Mind

Much of the interest in De Anima remains in Aristotle's account of the various psychological functions. Leading the list is perception, discussed first generally:

\* De Anima II 5-6

then specifically:

De Anima II 7-11

and then generally again:

\* De Anima II 12 - III 2

Related to the De Anima is a collection of works called the Parva Naturalia, and these works extend Aristotle's thoughts about psychological functions. There are, for example, several passages in the Parva Naturalia that shed light on the mysterious "common sense:"

On Sleep 2 through 455b12

Sense and Sensibilia 7 448b18-449a19

On Memory 1 449b30-450a14, 451a15-19

On Dreams 1 459a15-21

On Youth and Old Age 1 and 3 469a10-23

(cf. Parts of Animals II 10 656a28-b7 and II 1 647a21-b8)

For discussion, see

Modrak, Aristotle: The Power of Perception.

Everson, Aristotle on Perception

Among the special problems is the demarcation of five senses. See

Sorabji, "Aristotle on demarcating the five senses,"

Philosophical Review 80 (1971): 55-79, reprinted in Articles on Aristotle, vol. 4

One of the most original features of Aristotelian psychology is its attempt to account for a kind of thought beyond perception but beneath belief:

\* De Anima III 3

The account of imagination is also important for making sense of animal locomotion (the locomotive soul). See

\* De Anima III 9-11

De Motu Animalium

On the latter, see especially

Nussbaum, Aristotle's De Motu Animalium

Among the many interesting discussions of Aristotelian imagination (phantasia), see especially

\* Schofield, "Aristotle on the Imagination," in Articles on Aristotle, vol. 4

Finally, in the middle of De Anima III, Aristotle discusses intellect:

\* De Anima III 4-8

These chapters have attracted an enormous amount of commentary, including:

Modrak, "Aristotle on thinking," Proceedings of the Boston Area Colloquium in Ancient Philosophy 2 (1987): 209-236

Some overview of the historical puzzling over the distinction between active and passive intellect, along with a standard take the distinction, can be found in

Ross, Aristotle: De Anima, 41-48

For a clever attempt to push the standard view aside, you might look at Caston, "Aristotle's Two Intellects: A modest proposal."

Phronesis 44 (1999): 199ff.

Feb 21

What is First Philosophy?

One of the most vexed questions for Aristotle's Metaphysics is also the most basic: what is it all about? The text itself seems to be a hotch-potch, and Aristotle seems to give different accounts of the subject-matter of first philosophy at various points:

\* Metaphysics A (I) 1 980a20 - 3 983b6

\* Physics I 1 and I 9 192a34-192b2

\* Metaphysics B (III) 1

\* Metaphysics G (IV) 1 1003a21 - 2 1003b19

\* Metaphysics E (VI) 1

There have been many different attempts to say what Aristotelian first philosophy really is. To glean a sense of the some leading possibilities read the following studies, which also argue for what has been the most influential interpretation in the last 50 years:

Owen, "Logic and Metaphysics in some Earlier Works of Aristotle," reprinted in Articles on Aristotle, vol. 3, reprinted in Logic, Science, and Dialectic

Patzig, "Theology and Ontology in Aristotle's Metaphysics," in Articles on Aristotle, vol. 3

Frede, "The Unity of General and Special Metaphysics: Aristotle's Conception of Metaphysics," in Essays in Ancient Philosophy

For valuable explication and critical evaluation of Owen's contribution, see

Code, "Owen on the Development of Aristotle's Metaphysics"

Aristotle in part defines first philosophy by discussing what his predecessors have said about it. See

Metaphysics A (I)

There is much to say about this text, both in terms of the philosophers Aristotle is discussing and in terms of the way in which Aristotle is discussing them. But time does not permit. I would be remiss, however, were I not to note that Aristotle as an historian does not get much respect. The locus classicus, which probably overstates the matter, comes in

Cherniss, Aristotle's Criticism of Presocratic Philosophy

Aristotle also partly defines first philosophy by summarizing the puzzles it must solve. See

\* Metaphysics B (III) 1

\* Metaphysics B (III) 2-6

\* Metaphysics K (X)

Discussions of the puzzles include:

Halper, "The Origin of the aporiai in Metaphysics B," Apeiron 21 (1988): 1-27.

- unassigned     **Axioms, especially the Principle of Non-Contradiction**  
 In solving one of first philosophy's puzzles, Aristotle decides that first philosophy includes the study of logical axioms, and then he discusses as the most fundamental logical axiom the principle of non-contradiction (i.e., the claim that Not-(p and not-p)):  
    Metaphysics G (IV) 3-4  
 For two influential interpretations of these chapters, see  
    Anscombe, in Anscombe and Geach, Three Philosophers  
    Lukasiewicz, "On the principle of contradiction," Review of Metaphysics 95 (1971): 485-509, reprinted in Articles on Aristotle, vol. 3  
 See also  
    Code, "Metaphysics and Logic," in Aristotle Today, ed. Matthen
- Feb 23     **Sensible Substance**  
 Aristotle treats sensible substance in Books Z, H, and Θ (VII, VIII, and IX). Why is he discussing sensible substance? Because substance is primary being, to which all other being is referred. See  
    \* Metaphysics G (IV) 2  
    \* Metaphysics Z (VII) 1  
 Some kinds of being are not really worth considering, like being accidentally and being true. See  
    Metaphysics E (VI) 2-4  
    Metaphysics Θ (IX) 10  
 Book Z (VII) seems to be a self-contained unit on the question 'What is substance?' So, what is the answer to that question, and how does Z deliver that answer? Our primary text:  
    \* Metaphysics Z (VII)  
 It is worth noticing that the first paragraph of H 1 seems to summarize Z:  
    \* Metaphysics H (VIII) 1 through 1042a22  
 While trying to get clear on the general point and structure of Z, it is good to consider the problem posed by  
    \* Owen, "Particular and General," in Logic, Science, and Dialectic (E-Res)  
 As we go, if you want to read beyond the syllabus, you should first avail yourself of the valuable commentaries. In addition to commentaries by Ross and in the Clarendon Aristotle series, no one should skip  
    Burnyeat, ed. Notes on Zeta  
    Burnyeat, ed. Notes on Theta  
    Frede and Patzig. Aristoteles: Metaphysik Z  
    Kirwan, Aristotle: Metaphysics Books Z and H  
    Burnyeat, A Map of Metaphysics Zeta  
 Among recent monographs, consider  
    Gill, Aristotle on Substance  
    Lewis, Substance and Predication in Aristotle  
    Loux, Primary Ousia  
    Reeve, Substantial Knowledge: Aristotle's Metaphysics  
    Wedin, Aristotle's Theory of Substance  
    Witt, Substance and Essence in Aristotle  
 For general discussion of Aristotle's strategy in Metaphysics Z, see also  
    Code, "The Aporematic Approach to Primary Being in Metaphysics Z," Canadian Journal of Philosophy (1984)
- Feb 28     **The Central Puzzle concerning Sensible Substance**

The answer in Z seems to be that substance is form. But Owen's problem of particular and general remains. Does each sensible substance have a particular form? (If so, how is the definition, which expresses the form, universal?) Or is form general? (If so, how is substance a 'this' and how are particular sensible substances individuated?) Again, the text is

\* Metaphysics Z (VII) - H (VIII) 1 1042a22

Here are some classic treatments of the central issue that we will take as our starting points:

\* Ross, Aristotle's Metaphysics, cxv-cxix (**E-Res**)

Sellars, "Substance and form in Aristotle," Journal of Philosophy 54 (1957): 688-699

Albritton, "Forms of particular substances in Aristotle's Metaphysics," Journal of Philosophy 54 (1957): 699-707.

Charlton, "Aristotle and the principle of individuation," Phronesis 17 (1972): 239-249

Frede, "Substance in Aristotle's Metaphysics," in Essays in Ancient Philosophy

\* Frede, "Individuals in Aristotle," in Essays in Ancient Philosophy, esp. 63-71 (**E-Res**)

Code, "Aristotle: Essence and Accident," in Philosophical Grounds of Rationality, ed. Grandy and Warner

Of course, the answer to the big question depends in no small part on how we think Aristotle conceives of matter. For emphasis on this angle, see

Anscombe, "The Principle of Individuation," in Articles on Aristotle, vol. 3

Code, "The Persistence of Aristotelian Matter," Philosophical Studies 29 (1976): 357-367.

Dancy, "On some of Aristotle's second thoughts about substance: matter," Philosophical Review 87 (1978): 372-413

Fine, "Aristotle on Matter," Mind 101 (1992): 35-57

Moreover, we need to make sense of Aristotle's claim in Z 13 that no universal is a substance. See

Code, "No universal is a substance," Paideia 7 (1978): 65-74

Last, we should try to understand Aristotelian essentialism as a philosophical position. Concentrate especially on

\* Metaphysics Z (VII) 4-6, 10-12

Here are some relevant secondary texts:

Copi, "Essence and Accident," Journal of Philosophy 51 (1954): 706-19.

\* Code, "Aristotle: Essence and Accident," in Philosophical Grounds of Rationality, ed. Grandy and Warner (**E-Res**)

Mar 2

### Extending the Account of Sensible Substance

Aristotle continues to discuss sensible substance after summarizing the account of Z in H 1. Several wrinkles are introduced, as change in sensible substance is considered. Chiefly, we get some account of substance in terms of potentiality and actuality, and we get more concrete hints of non-sensible substance. See

\* Metaphysics Z (VII) 7-9

\* Metaphysics H (VIII) 1 1042a23 - 6

\* Metaphysics Y (IX) 1-9

Among others, there are large questions about the relation between the potentialities and actualities of this work and those appearing elsewhere, on which see

Menn, "The Origins of Aristotle's Concept of Energeia: Energeia and Dynamis," Ancient Philosophy 15 (1994)

\* Frede, "Aristotle's Notion of Potentiality in Metaphysics  $\Theta$ ," in Unity, Identity, and Explanation in Aristotle's Metaphysics, ed. Scaltsas, Charles, and Gill (**E-Res**)

There is also much to say about the narrow distinction between energeia and kinesis at the end of  $\Upsilon$  6. See

Ackrill, "Aristotle's distinction between energeia and kinesis," in New Essays on Plato and Aristotle, ed. Bambrough

**Mar 3           Deadline to Petition for Research Paper Option**

Mar 7           Cosmology and Theology, in the Physics

Thus far, we have considered Aristotle's discussion of the natural world around us, underneath the orbit of the moon (and hence "sublunary"). But there are heavens, too, and they need to be studied. The heavens are the special topic of De Caelo. Read at least

\* De Caelo I 1-3

And with the De Caelo, compare the account of heavenly locomotion in

\* Physics VII 1-2

\* Physics VIII 1-10

\* Generation and Corruption II 10

On Physics VIII, you might want the help of

Ross, Aristotle: Physics, 85-94

Graham, Aristotle: Physics Book VIII

Our old question concerning chronology is discussed by

Ross, Aristotle: Physics, 94-102

Mar 9           Cosmology and Theology, in the Metaphysics

The primary text is

\* Metaphysics L (XII) 6-10

But see also the set-up at the start of this self-contained treatise:

\* Metaphysics L (XII) 1

On the theology itself, see

Norman, "Aristotle's Philosopher-God," in Articles on Aristotle, vol. 4

unassigned   Transcendentals

Another puzzle concerning first philosophy that Aristotle raises concerns the transcendentals. He takes up this puzzle in

Metaphysics G (IV) 2

Metaphysics I (X)

unassigned   Mathematicals and Forms

Yet another potential subject for first philosophy, these are the special topic of

Metaphysics M (XI) and N (XII)

For these books there is a commentary

Annas, Metaphysics Books M and N

Mar 14           NO CLASS — Spring Break

Mar 16           NO CLASS — Spring Break

**Mar 20 First Short Essay Due**

Mar 21

The Human Good

The first and last topic of Aristotle's ethics and politics is the idea of the chief good for human beings. It is a matter of central importance and much controversy. The main texts are

\* [Nicomachean Ethics I 1-7 and X 6-8](#)

It is very difficult to see clearly what Aristotle is doing. Try to isolate the following questions. First, what is Aristotle's conception of that chief good, happiness? Does he have the same conception in Books One and Ten?

For two important, opposed approaches, see

Ackrill, "Aristotle on [Eudaimonia](#)," in [Essays in Aristotle's Ethics](#), ed. Rorty

Kraut, "Aristotle on the Human Good: An Overview," in [Aristotle's Ethics: Critical Essays](#), ed. Sherman

Second, for each of Book One and Book Ten, why does Aristotle believe that happiness is what he says it is? There are many reasons, and it pays to try to list them. But scholars have not gone wrong by focusing most on the "function" argument of I 7. See

Irwin, "The Metaphysical and Psychological Basis of Aristotle's Ethics," in [Essays in Aristotle's Ethics](#), ed. Rorty

\* Brown, "Notes on [Nicomachean Ethics I 7 1097b22-1098a20](#)"  
([email](#))

Very helpful discussion on both of the above questions can also be found in

Broadie, [Ethics with Aristotle](#), chp. 1

See also the recent contributions supporting Kraut:

Lear, [Happy Lives and the Highest Good](#)

Van Cleemput, "Aristotle on [Eudaimonia](#) in [Nicomachean Ethics I](#)," forthcoming in [Oxford Studies in Ancient Philosophy](#)  
([email me](#))

But also we should ask ourselves what difference X 6-8 makes for Aristotle's view of what the best human life is. Contrasting approaches to this question can be found in

Keyt, "Intellectualism in Aristotle," in [Essays in Ancient Greek Philosophy](#), vol. 2, ed. Anton and Preus

Brown, "Aristotle on the Choice of Lives: Two Concepts of Self-Sufficiency," forthcoming ([email me](#))

See also

Broadie, [Ethics with Aristotle](#), chp. 7

Mar 23 NO CLASS—Instructor out of town

Mar 28 The Human Good (continued)  
Same readings.

Mar 30 The Human Good and Other Goods

After defining the human good in I 7, Aristotle tests it against what is commonly said about human happiness or success.

\* [Nicomachean Ethics I 8-12](#)

It is commonly thought that Aristotle loosens his conception of the human good in these chapters. See, e.g.,

Cooper, "Aristotle on the Goods of Fortune," [Philosophical Review](#) 94 (1985): 173-196

Irwin, "Permanent Happiness: Aristotle and Solon," in  
Aristotle's Ethics: Critical Essays, ed. Sherman

I have argued to the contrary:

\* Brown, "Wishing for Fortune, Choosing Activity," forthcoming  
in the Proceedings of the Boston Area Colloquium in Ancient  
Philosophy (email)

A more widely read version of Irwin's thesis can be found in the following  
broader and flashier study:

Nussbaum, The Fragility of Goodness

There is an interesting philosophical background to these discussions:

Williams, "Moral Luck," in Moral Luck

Nagel, "Moral Luck," in Mortal Questions

Williams, "Moral Luck: a postscript," in Making Sense of  
Humanity

Apr 4

#### Excellence of Character in General

Since Aristotle defines the human good as activity in accordance with  
excellence, he turns next to an account of excellence, which he divides  
into excellence of character and excellence of intellect.

\* Nicomachean Ethics I 13 - II

One might compare

Eudemian Ethics II 1-5

First, we'll focus on the doctrine of the mean that seems central to defining  
ethical excellence. See the discussions of:

Urmson, "Aristotle's Doctrine of the Mean," in Essays in  
Aristotle's Ethics, ed. Rorty, esp. 157-164

Hursthouse. "A False Doctrine of the Mean," in Aristotle's  
Ethics: Critical Essays, ed. Sherman, esp. 105-109

Broadie, Ethics with Aristotle, 95-103

A second feature of Aristotle's account of ethical excellence that deserves  
attention is the role of habituation. On this, see

Sherman, "The Habituation of Character," in Aristotle's Ethics:  
Critical Essays, ed. Sherman

Broadie, Ethics with Aristotle, 103-110

Apr 6

#### Excellence of Character in Particular

Aristotle spends a considerable amount of time discussing individual  
virtues in

\* Nicomachean Ethics III 5 1115a4 - IV 9

Among the best discussions of individual virtues are

Pears, "Courage as a Mean," in Essays on Aristotle's Ethics, ed.  
Rorty

Young, "Aristotle on temperance," Philosophical Review 97  
(1988): 521-542

Apr 11

#### Justice

The virtue "justice"—which is considerably broader than you might guess  
from the translation—gets a fuller discussion in

\* Nicomachean Ethics V

Our mandatory reading here is

\* Williams, "Justice as a Virtue," in Essays on Aristotle's Ethics,  
ed. Rorty (**E-Res**)

Apr 13

#### The Psychology of Character: Willing, Choosing, Wishing

Wegged between his general account of virtue and his account particular virtues is a self-contained mini-treatise on how virtue is under our control and a rightful matter for praise. Our principal text:

\* Nicomachean Ethics III 1-5

One might want to compare

Eudemian Ethics II 6-11

And see

Broadie, Ethics with Aristotle, chp. 3

Anscombe, "Thought and Action in Aristotle," in Articles on Aristotle, vol. 2

Apr 18

### Intellectual Excellence

Book Six is devoted to intellectual virtues. We should like to get a grasp on the overall picture:

\* Nicomachean Ethics VI

It is interesting to compare this book with the remarks in

\* Metaphysics A (I) 1

But we also want to raise some particular problems in the account. First, what does practical deliberation look like? How does it proceed?

Principally, is it always a kind of instrumental reasoning, or does it involve reasoning about the ends?

Our secondary reading:

Allan, "Aristotle's Account of the Origin of Moral Principles," in Articles on Aristotle, vol. 2

Wiggins, "Deliberation and Practical Reason," in Essays on Aristotle's Ethics, ed. Rorty

Apr 20

### Intellectual Excellence (continued)

Another looming question in Book VI concerns the relation between deliberation and what has been called "moral perception." To what extent does good activity require deliberation, and to what extent does it require simply "seeing what to do?" Relatedly, perhaps (is it related?), to what extent does good activity depend upon experience and habituation, and to what extent does it require ability and training in thinking things through more theoretically? To answer these three questions, needless to say, we will need to say something about what exactly it means to have "moral perception," to "see what to do." Here are some crucial texts:

\* Nicomachean Ethics VI

Here are a couple of discussions that rub up against our queries:

\* McDowell, "Virtue and Reason," in Aristotle's Ethics: Critical Essays, ed. Sherman

Sorabji, "Aristotle on the Role of Intellect in Virtue," Essays on Aristotle's Ethics, ed. Rorty

Nussbaum, "The Discernment of Perception: An Aristotelian Account of Private and Public Rationality," in Aristotle's Ethics: Critical Essays, ed. Sherman

unassigned

### Akrasia

Akrasia is a Greek word which means (etymologically) "powerlessness," and it is used to describe a person's voluntary decision to do other than what she thinks she should do. Understanding this apparent failure of rationality is crucial for a grasp of how to become good (and of how to help others become good), and yet it is very difficult to understand. Aristotle's discussions is the most extended in the history of philosophy up until the 1950s:

Nicomachean Ethics VII 1-10

After WWII, some philosophers began to realize that akrasia was really a philosophical problem, and this realization came hand-in-hand with the recognition that Aristotle had something interesting to say about it. Of course, no one can agree about what Aristotle says. Read these three interestingly different reconstructions:

Robinson, "Aristotle on Akrasia," in Articles on Aristotle, vol. 2

Irwin, Aristotle: Nicomachean Ethics, 350-353

Mele, "Aristotle on Akrasia and Knowledge"

A slightly broader view is taken by

Mele, "Aristotle on Akrasia, Eudaimonia, and the Psychology of Action"

And for a still broader view, see especially

Burnyeat, "Aristotle on Learning to be Good," in Essays on Aristotle's Ethics, ed. Rorty, and in Aristotle's Ethics: Critical Essays, ed. Sherman

Contemporary accounts of akrasia virtually always have something to say about Aristotle. The most influential contemporary account is

Davidson, "How is Weakness of Will Possible?," in Essays on Actions and Events

#### unassigned Pleasure

Pleasure is one of the most notoriously difficult philosophical topics. Anscombe says, in fact, that it is so difficult that it reduced Aristotle to babble. Judge for yourself by comparing his two accounts of pleasure:

Nicomachean Ethics VII 11-14

Nicomachean Ethics X 1-5

We will read the standard article on this topic, which is

Owen, "Aristotelian Pleasures," Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society 72 (1971-1972): 135-152, reprinted in Articles on Aristotle, vol. 2, reprinted in Logic, Science, and Dialectic

Other attempts to see clearly through murky waters include:

Gosling and Taylor, The Greeks on Pleasure, chps. 11-17

Broadie, Ethics with Aristotle, chp. 6.

#### Apr 25 Friendship and Politics

Books VIII and IX are about philia, conventionally translated as "friendship" but in fact representative of a far broader range of relationships. Our primary text concerns nothing less than the character and role of affective relationships to other people in the good human life:

\* Nicomachean Ethics VIII-IX

When reading this text, be careful about assuming that only friends are at issue. Sometimes, Aristotle is talking about friends, and sometimes he is talking about a broader category of affective relationships. Important (though controversial) background to the broader category, which is not required reading but is well worth the time, is

Adkins, "'Friendship' and 'Self-Sufficiency' in Homer and Aristotle," Classical Quarterly 13 (1963): 30-45.

Required secondary reading and the touchstone for recent philosophical discussions of EN VIII-IX is

Cooper, "Aristotle on Friendship," in Essays on Aristotle's Ethics, ed. Rorty

If you are interested in a different perspective, there are many more recent discussions of Aristotle on "friendship." One of the most interesting and pithy is

Konstan, Friendship in the Classical World, esp. 67-78.

See also Pakaluk's Clarendon Aristotle commentary on the text and Annas, "Plato and Aristotle on Friendship and Altruism," Mind 86 (1977): 532-554  
Nussbaum, The Fragility of Goodness, 343-372  
Millgram, "Aristotle on making other selves," Canadian Journal of Philosophy 17 (1987): 361-376  
Price, Love and Friendship in Plato and Aristotle  
Stern-Gillet, Aristotle's Philosophy of Friendship  
There are political dimensions to Aristotle's discussion of friendship. You might start by considering  
Cooper in Patzig  
Annas on Cooper in Patzig  
For background, see  
Mitchell, Greeks Bearing Gifts: The Public Use of Private Relationships in the Greek World, 435-323 BC  
For those of you interested in comparing Aristotle's treatment of friends and other affective relationships, with recent work that (finally!) is overcoming modern moral philosophy's virtual silence on the topic, I especially recommend  
Pakaluk, ed. Other Selves: Philosophers on Friendship (Hackett, 1991)  
Badhwar, ed., Friendship: A Philosophical Reader (Cornell, 1993)  
Friedman, What Are Friends For? (Cornell, 1993)  
Relatedly, the connection between Aristotle and the concerns of feminist ethics is plumbed by  
Homiak, "Feminism and Aristotle's Rational Ideal," in Aristotle's Ethics: Critical Essays, ed. Sherman

Apr 27

#### Ethics and Politics

One of the striking things about Aristotle's ethics is how much politics is packed into it. See especially  
\* Nicomachean Ethics I 1-3, 7  
\* Nicomachean Ethics X 6-9  
\* Politics I 1-2  
One take on the three theses of Politics I 2 that are so central is in  
\* Brown, "Aristotle on the Choice of Lives: Two Concepts of Self-Sufficiency," forthcoming (**email**)  
If you have time, you might want to look at the best introduction to Aristotle's political thought:  
Kraut, Aristotle: Political Philosophy  
Recently, much debate on Aristotle's political thought has focused on  
Miller, Nature, Justice, and Rights in Aristotle's Politics  
For some of the debate, see  
Review of Metaphysics 49:4 (June 1996)

unassigned Political Theory, Rhetoric, and Poetics

**May 3 Second Short Essay Due**

**May 5 Research Paper Due**

**May 9 Exam, 1-3 pm, Prince 232**