

DS 4/27/23 Anscombe

-Review: Anscombe's "Wittgensteinian 'Skepticism'"

I know that a sick man is lying here? Nonsense! I am sitting at his bedside. I am looking attentively into his face.—So I don't know, then, that there is a sick man lying here? Neither the question nor the assertion makes sense.

-Review: 6b.7-9 (with 2a.7 in the background): understanding Anscombe's position on Hume's argument

-9b.7-10a.2: disgrace or prison dilemma

-9b.top: Sidgwick's key move (toward what we can call "new-fangled consequentialism," based on 10b.3): Intention and DDE

-8b.5-9a.2: the "Hebrew-Christian ethic" and absolute prohibitions

-12: towards a "norm"-based ethics

-compare Anscombe's claim that "there can be absolutely no argument about" about the injustice of the act at 13a.2 with what "these philosophers" "take for obvious" at 9a.2

-13a-b: Injustice and consequences

-Substantive vs. Merely verbal disagreements involving key philosophical terms and "Wittgensteinian 'skepticism'"

-Final exam: format

-Zoom office hours next week