

09.10.2025

## Literatur zur Tugendethik Bibliography on virtue ethics

Alphabetische Ordnung / alphabetical order:

<http://www.ethikseite.de/bib/bvirtue.pdf>

Chronologische Ordnung / reverse chronological order:

<http://www.ethikseite.de/bib/cvirtue.pdf>

- 1988 [1] Ackerman, Felicia (1988): A Man by Nothing Is so Well Betrayed as by His Manners? Politeness as a Virtue, in *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* Vol. XIII: *Ethical Theory: Character and Virtue*, hrsg. von Peter A. French, Theodore E. Uehling, Jr. und Howard K. Wettstein, Notre Dame, S. 250–58.
- 1988 [2] Adams, Robert M. (1988): Common Projects and Moral Virtue, in *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* Vol. XIII: *Ethical Theory: Character and Virtue*, hrsg. von Peter A. French, Theodore E. Uehling, Jr. und Howard K. Wettstein, Notre Dame, S. 297–307.
- 2006 [3] Adams, Robert M. (2006): *A Theory of Virtue. Excellence in Being for the Good*, Oxford.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> “The distinguished philosopher Robert M. Adams presents a major work on virtue, which is once again a central topic in ethical thought. *A Theory of Virtue* is a systematic, comprehensive framework for thinking about the moral evaluation of character. Many recent attempts to stake out a place in moral philosophy for this concern define virtue in terms of its benefits for the virtuous person or for human society more generally. In Part One of this book Adams presents and defends a conception of virtue as intrinsic excellence of character, worth prizing for its own sake and not only for its benefits. In the other two parts he addresses two challenges to the ancient idea of excellence of character. One challenge arises from the importance of altruism in modern ethical thought, and the question of what altruism has to do with intrinsic excellence. Part Two argues that altruistic benevolence does indeed have a crucial place in excellence of character, but that moral virtue should also be expected to involve excellence in being for other goods besides the well-being (and the rights) of other persons. It explores relations among cultural goods, personal relationships, one’s own good, and the good of others, as objects of excellent motives. The other challenge, the subject of Part Three of the book, is typified by doubts about the reality of moral virtue, arising from experiments and conclusions in social psychology. Adams explores in detail the prospects for an empirically realistic conception of excellence of character as an object of moral aspiration, endeavor, and education. He argues that such a conception will involve renunciation of the ancient thesis of the unity or mutual implication of all virtues, and acknowledgment of sufficient ‘moral luck’ in the development of any

- 2010 [4] Adams, Robert M. (2010): A Theory of Virtue: Introductory Remarks, *Philosophical Studies* 148, S. 133f.
- 2010 [5] Adams, Robert Merrihew (2010): A Theory of Virtue: Response to Critics, *Philosophical Studies* 148, S. 159–65. – Zu [184], [321].
- 2016 [6] Akrivou, Kleio/Sison, Alejo José G. (Hrsg.) (2016): *The Challenges of Capitalism for Virtue Ethics and the Common Good. Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, Cheltenham.
- 1982 [7] Alderman, Harold (1982): By Virtue of a Virtue, *Review of Metaphysics* 36. Wiederabgedruckt (in revidierter Version) in *Virtue Ethics. A Critical Reader*, hrsg. von Daniel Statman, Edinburgh 1997, S. 145–64.
- 2011 [8] Alfano, Mark (2011): Explaining Away Intuitions About Traits: Why Virtue Ethics Seems Plausible (Even if it Isn't), *Review of Philosophy and Psychology* 2, S. 121–36.<sup>2</sup>
- 2013 [9] Alfano, Mark (2013): *Character as Moral Fiction*, Cambridge.
- 2013 [10] Alfano, Mark/Fairweather, Abrol (2013): Oxford Bibliographies: Situationism and Virtue Theory, <http://www.oxfordbibliographies.com/view/document/obo-9780195396577/obo-9780195396577-0236.xml>
- 2020 [11] Ali, Arden (2020): Manifestations of Virtue, in *Oxford Studies in Normative Ethics* 10, hrsg. von Mark Timmons, Oxford, S. 229–54.
- 2004 [12] Allard-Nelson, Susan K. (2004): *An Aristotelian Approach to Ethical Theory – The Norms of Virtue*, Lewiston, NY.<sup>3</sup>

---

individual's character to make virtue very largely a gift, rather than an individual achievement, though nonetheless excellent and admirable for that.

Contents: Part One: What Is Virtue? 1. Introduction 2. Excellence in Being for the Good 3. Wickedness and Vices 4. Virtue and its Benefits Part Two: Self and Other 5. Altruism 6. Common Projects 7. Self-Love and the Vices of Self-Preference Part Three: Are There Really Any Virtues? 8. Moral Inconsistency 9. Moral Frailty and Moral Luck 10. Do the Virtues All Imply Each Other? 11. Plural and Integrated Virtue 12. Can Virtue Be Taught?"

<sup>2</sup> "This article addresses the question whether we can know on the basis of folk intuitions that we have character traits. I answer in the negative, arguing that on any of the primary theories of knowledge, our intuitions about traits do not amount to knowledge. For instance, because we would attribute traits to one another regardless of whether we actually possessed such metaphysically robust dispositions, Nozickian sensitivity theory disqualifies our intuitions about traits from being knowledge. Yet we do think we know that we have traits, so I am advancing an error theory, which means that I owe an account of why we fall into error. Why do we feel so comfortable navigating the language of traits if we lack knowledge of them? To answer this question, I refer to a slew of heuristics and biases. Some, like the fundamental attribution error, the false consensus effect, and the power of construal, pertain directly to trait attributions. Others are more general cognitive heuristics and biases whose relevance to trait attributions requires explanation and can be classed under the headings of input heuristics and biases and processing heuristics and biases. Input heuristics and biases include selection bias, availability bias, availability cascade, and anchoring. Processing heuristics and biases include disregard of base rates, disregard of regression to the mean, and confirmation bias."

- 2013 [13] Alzola, Miguel (2013): The Empirics of Virtue Theory: What Can Psychology Tell Us About Moral Character?, in *Handbook of the Philosophical Foundations of Business Ethics*, hrsg. von Christoph Luetge, Dordrecht, S. 89–107.<sup>4</sup>
- 2018 [14] Alzola, Miguel (2018): Character-Based Business Ethics, in *The Oxford Handbook of Virtue*, hrsg. von Nancy E. Snow, Oxford, S. 591–620.
- 2013 [15] Amaya, Amalia/ Lai, Ho Hock (Hrsg.) (2013): *Law, Virtue and Justice*, Oxford.
- 2015 [16] Andre, Judith (2015): *Worldly Virtue. Moral Ideals and Contemporary Life*, London.<sup>5</sup>
- 2013 [17] Angle, Stephen C./Slote, Michael (Hg.): *Virtue Ethics and Confucianism*, London.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup> “The project of this work is to combine an interpretative study of Aristotle’s thinking about the foundational elements of ethical theory with the formulation of a theory of ethical normativity that is based on those same elements, but that is independently formulated and analyzed. In particular, the book argues that virtue ethics, of an Aristotelian type, can provide a coherent and satisfying theory of normativity, although this has sometimes been denied in modern scholarship. Normativity is sometimes thought to require a theory of a deductive type, in which ethical norms are derived from the principle of universalization (Kant’s view) or from a universal principle, such as, in Utilitarianism, the maximization of human happiness. The claim here is that normativity can also, and more plausibly, be established inductively through an examination of human nature-as understood through a variety of means, including the ethical agent’s own sense of what human nature consists in and scientific psychology-and the interrelated Aristotelian ideas of virtue, happiness, and particular relationships. The suggestion is that, if norms are grounded in this way, we can establish a normative framework that corresponds to the reality of human shared and individual experience and that is, therefore, more cogent than one that depends (deductively) on abstract, universal principles. This Aristotelian, inductive, theory is offered as embodying a cogent account of ethical normativity, which represents a contribution to current philosophical debate on the nature and basis of ethical norms.

Contents: Abbreviations. Notes on Terminology and Translation. Preface. Acknowledgments. Introduction. 1. Principles, Guidelines, and Particular Facts. 2. Human Nature, Telos, and the Human Capacity for Excellence. 3. The Development of Character: Human Excellence, Emotion, Neurobiology, and the Moral Virtues. 4. Partiality, Universalizability, and the Function of Normative Theory. Conclusion. Bibliography. Index”

<sup>4</sup> “In this chapter, I submit that virtue theory offers the best framework to account for our moral experience in life and in the context of business decision-making. And I argue against an empirically grounded objection to virtue theory, which holds that character traits of the sort postulated by virtue theorists do not exist because differences in social circumstances explain people’s behavior rather than any character trait. The objection does not succeed because virtue is rarer than we may expect, because the experimental evidence does not support the claim that character lacks any explanatory power, because virtues cannot be merely reduced to behavioral dispositions, and because virtue theory is concerned with the whole span of a human life rather than isolated behavior.”

<sup>5</sup> Contents: Acknowledgments. 1. Framing Worldly Virtues. 2. Earthly Virtue. 3. Open Hope. 4 Honoring Oneself: And Sacrificing Oneself? 5. Defining Compassion. 6. Generosity Revisited. 7. Facets of Honesty. 8. Humility Reconsidered. 9. Complicating Temperance. 10 Virtue and Age. Bibliography. Index. About the Author.

- 1992 [18] Annas, Julia (1992): Ancient Ethics and Modern Morality, in *Philosophical Perspectives*, 6, *Ethics*, 1992, hrsg. von James E. Tomberlin, Atascadero, Cal., S. 119–36.
- 1993 [19] Annas, Julia (1993): *The Morality of Happiness*, New York.
- 1995 [20] Annas, Julia (1995): Virtue as a Skill, *International Journal of Philosophical Studies* 3, S. 227–43.
- 1998 [21] Annas, Julia (1998): Virtue and Eudaimonism, in *Virtue and Vice*, hrsg. von Ellen Frankel Paul, Fred D. Miller, Jr. und Jeffrey Paul, Cambridge, S. 37–55.
- 2002 [22] Annas, Julia (2002): My Station and Its Duties: Ideals and the Social Embeddedness of Virtue, *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 102, S. 109–123.<sup>7</sup>
- 2003 [23] Annas, Julia (2003): The Structure of Virtue, in *Intellectual Virtue – Perspectives from Ethics and Epistemology*, hrsg. von Micheal DePaul und Linda Zagzebski, Oxford, S. 15–33.
- 2004 [24] Annas, Julia (2004): Being Virtuous and Doing the Right Thing, *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 78 (2), S. 61–75.
- 2005 [25] Annas, Julia (2005): Comments on John Doris's *Lack of Character*, *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 71, S. 636–42. – Vgl. dazu: [183].
- 2005 [26] Annas, Julia (2005): Virtue Ethics: What Kind of Naturalism?, in *Virtue Ethics, Old and New*, hrsg. von Stephen M. Gardiner, Ithaca, S. 11–29.
- 2008 [27] Annas, Julia (2008): Virtue Ethics and the Charge of Egoism, in *Morality and Self-Interest*, hrsg. von Paul Bloomfield, Oxford, S. 205–23. – Dazu [437].
- 2008 [28] Annas, Julia (2008): The Phenomenology of Virtue, *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences* 7, S. 21–34.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> 1. Stephen C. Angle und Michael Slote: Introduction. Part One: Debating the Scope and Applicability of Virtue and Virtue Ethics. 2. Chen Lai: Virtue Ethics and Confucian Ethics. 3. Philip J. Ivanhoe: Virtue Ethics and the Chinese Confucian Tradition. 4. Lee Ming-huei: Confucianism, Kant, and Virtue Ethics. 5. Bryan Van Norden: Toward a Synthesis of Confucianism and Aristotelianism. 6. Liu Liangjian: Virtue Ethics and Confucianism: A Methodological Reflection. 7. Wong Wai-ying: Confucian Ethics and Virtue Ethics Revisited. Part Two: Happiness, Luck, and Ultimate Goals. 8. Michael Slote: The Impossibility of Perfection. 9. Matthew Walker: Structured Inclusivism about Human Flourishing: A Mengzian Formulation. 10. Benjamin Huff: The Target of Life in Aristotle and Wang Yangming. 11. Sean Walsh: Varieties of Moral Luck in Ethical and Political Philosophy for Confucius and Aristotle. Part Three: Practicality, Justification, and Action Guidance. 12. Yu Jiyuan: The Practicality of Ancient Virtue Ethics: Greece and China. 13. Lo Ping-cheung: How Virtues Provide Action Guidance – Confucian Military Virtues at Work. 14. Xiao Yang: Rationality and Virtue in the Mencius. 15. Huang Yong: Between Generalism and Particularism: The Cheng Brothers' Neo-Confucian Virtue Ethics. Part Four: Moral Psychology and Particular Virtues. 16. Sarah Rushing: What is Confucian Humility? 17. Stephen Angle: Is Conscientiousness a Virtue? Confucian Answers. 18. Kai Marchal: The Virtues of Justice in Zhu Xi. 19. Andrew Terjesen: Is Empathy the "One Thread" Running Through Confucianism? 20. Marion Hourdequin: The Limits of Empathy.

<sup>7</sup> "In the Stoics we find a combination of two perspectives which are commonly thought to conflict: the embedded perspective from within one's social context, and the universal perspective of the member of the moral community of rational beings. I argue that the Stoics do have a unified theory, one which avoids problems that trouble some modern theories which try to unite these perspectives."

- 2011 [29] Annas, Julia (2011): *Intelligent Virtue*, Oxford.<sup>9</sup>
- 2015 [30] Annas, Julia (2015): Applying Virtue to Ethics, *Journal of Applied Philosophy* 32,S. 1–14.<sup>10</sup>
- 1958 [31] Anscombe, G. E. M. (1958): Modern Moral Philosophy, *Philosophy* 33, S. 1–19. Wiederabgedruckt in Anscombe, *Collected Philosophical Papers*, Vol. 3: *Ethics, Religion and Politics*, Oxford 1981, S. 26–42, in Anscombe, *Human Life, Action and Ethics. Essays by G. E. M. Anscombe*, hrsg. von Mary Geach und Luke Gormally, Exeter 2005, S. 169–94 sowie in *Virtue Ethics*, hrsg. von Roger Crisp und Michael Slote, Oxford 1997, S. 26–44. – Moderne Moralphilosophie, in *Seminar: Sprache und Ethik. Zur Entwicklung der Metaethik*, hrsg. von Günther Grewendorf und Georg Meggle, Frankfurt a. M. 1974, S. 217–43.
- 2023 [32] Antich Peter (2023): Can There Be an Existentialist Virtue Ethics, *Journal of Value Inquiry* 57, S. 1–20.
- 1992 [33] Anzenbacher, Arno (1992): *Einführung in die Ethik*, Düsseldorf, S. 135–50 („Tugend“).
- 2008 [34] Appiah, Kwame Anthony (2008): *Experiments in Ethics*, Cambridge, Mass., S. 33–72 (“The Case against Character”).
- 2008 [35] Arjoon, Surendra (2008): Reconciling Situational Social Psychology with Virtue Ethics, *Inter-*

---

<sup>8</sup> “What is it like to be a good person? I examine and reject suggestions that this will involve having thoughts which have virtue or being a good person as part of their content, as well as suggestions that it might be the presence of feelings distinct from the virtuous person’s thoughts. Is there, then, anything after all to the phenomenology of virtue? I suggest that an answer is to be found in looking to Aristotle’s suggestion that virtuous activity is pleasant to the virtuous person. I try to do this, using the work of the contemporary social psychologist Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi and his work on the ‘flow experience’. Crucial here is the point that I consider accounts of virtue which take it to have the structure of a practical expertise or skill. It is when we are most engaged in skilful complex activity that the activity is experienced as ‘unimpeded’, in Aristotle’s terms, or as ‘flow’. This experience does not, as might at first appear, preclude thoughtful involvement and reflection. Although we can say what in general the phenomenology of virtue is like, each of us only has some more or less dim idea of it from the extent to which we are virtuous – that is, for most of us, not very much.”

<sup>9</sup> Table of Contents: Preface. 1: Introduction. 2: Virtue, Character, and Disposition. 3: Skilled and Virtuous Action. 4: The Scope of Virtue. 5: Virtue and Enjoyment. 6: Virtues and the Unity of Virtue. 7: Virtue and Goodness. 8: Living Happily. 9: Living Virtuously, Living Happily. 10: Conclusion.

<sup>10</sup> “Virtue ethics is sometimes taken to be incapable of providing guidance for an individual’s actions, as some other ethical theories do. I show how virtue ethics does provide guidance for action, and also meet the objection that, while it may account for what we ought to do, it cannot account for the force of duty and obligation.”

- 2007 [36] Armstrong, Alan E. (2007): *Nursing Ethics. A Virtue-Based Approach*, Houndmills.
- 2005 [37] Arpaly, Nomy (2005): Comments on *Lack of Character* by John Doris, *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 71, S. 643–47. – Vgl. dazu: [183].
- 2000 [38] Athanassoulis, Nafsika (2000): A Response to Harman: Virtue Ethics and Character Traits, *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 100, S. 215–21. – Zu [256]. Vgl. dazu [257].
- 2010 [39] Athanassoulis, Nafsika (2010): A Virtue Ethical Account of Making Decisions about Risk, *Journal of Risk Research* 13, S. 21730.<sup>12</sup>
- 2013 [40] Athanassoulis, Nafsika (2010): *Virtue Ethics*, London.<sup>13</sup>

---

<sup>11</sup> “For the past four decades, debate has occurred in respect of situational social psychology and virtue ethics. This paper attempts to reconcile this debate. Situationists propose a fragmentation theory of character (each person has a whole range of dispositions, each of which has a restricted situational application) and do not subscribe to a regularity theory of character (behaviour is regulated by long-term dispositions). In order to support this view, they cite a number of experiments. It is proposed that the substantive claims made by situationist social psychologists, for the most part, do not undermine or disagree with an Aristotelian virtue ethics perspective, but stem from a misunderstanding of concepts of moral character, faulty conclusions and generalizations in respect of experimental results. Situationists take a narrow view of character and morality. Evidence from organizational behaviour and managerial research literature supports the view that both situational (organizational) features and inner characteristics (including virtues) are powerful influences and determinants of morally upright and morally deviant behaviour. The role of practical judgement in bridging these views is discussed. As a way forward in reconciling situational social psychology with virtue ethics, the paper proposes an Aristotelian–Thomistic framework to overcome some of the problems associated with inadequate regulative ideals in building a normative moral theory.”

<sup>12</sup> “Most discussions of risk are developed in broadly consequentialist terms, focusing on the outcomes of risks as such. This paper will provide an alternative account of risk from a virtue ethical perspective, shifting the focus on the *decision* to take the risk. Making ethical decisions about risk is, we will argue, not fundamentally about the actual chain of events that the decision sets in process, but about the reasonableness of the decision to take the risk in the first place. A virtue ethical account of risk is needed because the notion of the ‘reasonableness’ of the decision to take the risk is affected by the complexity of the moral status of particular instances of risk-taking and the risk-taker’s responsiveness to these contextual features. The very idea of ‘reasonable risk’ welcomes judgements about the nature of the risk itself, raises questions about complicity, culpability and responsibility, while at its heart, involves a judgement about the justification of risk which unavoidably focuses our attention on the *character* of the individuals involved in risk-making decisions.”

<sup>13</sup> Contents: Acknowledgements \ Abbreviations, Sources and Translations \ Introduction \ Part I: Virtue Ethics as New Alternative \ 1. Virtue Ethics, A Revived Alternative \ 2. Ethics and Morality \ 3. Character and the Emotions \ Conclusion for Part I \ Part II: Virtue Ethics Comes of Age \ 4. Virtue; An Aristotelian Definition I \ 5. Virtue; An Aristotelian Definition II \ 6. A Naturalistic Account of Virtue \ Conclusion for Part II \ Part III: Current Developments in Virtue Ethics \ 7. The Challenge from Personality Psychology \ 8. Moral Education and the Virtues \ 9. The Kantian Response \ Conclusion for Part III \ Conclusion \ Notes \ Bibliography \ Index.

- 2018 [41] Athanassoulis, Nafsika (2018): Acquiring Aristotelian Virtue, in *The Oxford Handbook of Virtue*, hrsg. von Nancy E. Snow, Oxford, S. 415–31.
- 2024 [42] Athanassoulis, Nafsika (2024): The *Phronimos* as a Moral Exemplar. Two Internal Objections and a Proposed Solution, *Journal of Value Inquiry* 58, S. 131–50.
- 1995 [43] Audi, Robert (1995): Acting from Virtue, *Mind* 104, S. 449–71. Wiederabgedruckt in Audi, *Moral Knowledge and Ethical Character*, New York, Oxford, S. 174–92.
- 1988 [44] Audi, Robert (1998): A Liberal Theory of Civic Virtue, in *Virtue and Vice*, hrsg. von Ellen Frankel Paul, Fred D. Miller, Jr. und Jeffrey Paul, Cambridge, S. 149–70.
- 2009 [45] Audi, Robert (2009): Moral Virtue and Reasons for Action, *Philosophical Issues* 19, S. 1–20.
- 2013 [46] Austin, Michael W. (Hrsg.) (2013): *Virtues in Action. New Essays in Applied Virtue Ethics*, Houndmills, Basingstoke.
- 2010 [47] Axtell, Guy (2010): Agency Ascriptions in Ethics and Epistemology: Or, Navigating Intersections, Narrow and Broad, *Metaphilosophy* 41, S. 73–94.<sup>14</sup>
- 2012 [48] Axtell, Guy/Olson, Philip (2012): Recent Work in Applied Virtue Ethics, *American Philosophical Quarterly* 49, S. 183–203.
- 2000 [49] Bächli, Andreas/Graeser, Andreas (2000): Tugend, in dies., *Grundbegriffe der antiken Philosophie. Ein Lexikon*, Stuttgart, S. 216–21.
- 1996 [50] Badhwar, Neera K. (1996): The Limited Unity of Virtue, *Nous* 30, S. 306–29.
- 1997 [51] Badhwar, Neera K. (1997): Self-Interest and Virtue, *Social Philosophy and Policy* 14, S. 226–63.
- 2009 [52] Badhwar, Neera K. (2009): The Milgram Experiments, Learned Helplessness, and Character

---

<sup>14</sup> “In this article, the logic and functions of character-trait ascriptions in ethics and epistemology is compared, and two major problems, the “generality problem” for virtue epistemologies and the “global trait problem” for virtue ethics, are shown to be far more similar in structure than is commonly acknowledged. Beyond the aporia of character-trait ascription and between the Scylla and Charybdis that virtue theories are faced with in each field of philosophy, we find our passage by making full and explicit use of the “narrow-broad spectrum of trait ascription,” and by accounting for the various uses of it in an inquiry-pragmatist account. In virtue theories informed by inquiry pragmatism, the agential habits and abilities deemed salient in explanations/evaluations of agents in particular cases, and the determination of the relevant domains and conditions that an agent’s habit or ability is reliably efficacious in, is determined by pragmatic concerns related to our evaluative epistemic practices.”

Traits, *Journal of Ethics* 13, S. 257–89.<sup>15</sup>

- 2014 [53] Badhwar, Neera K. (2014): *Well-Being. Happiness in a Worthwhile Life*, Oxford.<sup>16</sup>
- 2022 [54] Badhwar, Neera K. (2022): Virtue Ethics, in *The Routledge Companion to Libertarianism*, hrsg. von Matt Zwolinski und Benjamin Ferguson, New York und Abingdon.
- 1992 [55] Baechler, Jean (1992): Virtue: Its Nature, Exigency, and Acquisition, in *Virtue (Nomos 34)*, hrsg. von John W. Chapman und William A. Galston, New York, S. 25–48.
- 2007 [56] Baehr, Jason (2007): On the Reliability of Moral and Intellectual Virtues, *Metaphilosophy* 38, S. 456–70.<sup>17</sup>
- 2010 [57] Baehr, Jason (2010): Epistemic Malevolence, *Metaphilosophy* 41, S. 189–213.<sup>18</sup>

---

<sup>15</sup> “The Milgram and other situationist experiments support the real-life evidence that most of us are highly akratic and heteronomous, and that Aristotelian virtue is not global. Indeed, like global theoretical knowledge, global virtue is psychologically impossible because it requires too much of finite human beings with finite powers in a finite life; virtue can only be domain-specific. But unlike local, situation-specific virtues, domain-specific virtues entail some general understanding of what matters in life, and are connected conceptually and causally to our traits in other domains. The experiments also make us aware of how easily unobtrusive situational factors can tap our susceptibilities to obedience, conformity, irresponsibility, cruelty, or indifference to others’ welfare, thereby empowering us to change ourselves for the better. Thus, they advance the Socratic project of living the examined life. I note a remarkable parallel between the results of the baseline Milgram experiments and the results of the learned helplessness experiments by Martin Seligman et al. This provides fresh insight into the psychology and character of the obedient Milgram subjects, and I use this insight to argue that pusillanimity, as Aristotle conceives of it, is part of a complete explanation of the behavior of the obedient Milgram subjects.”

<sup>16</sup> “This book offers a new argument for the ancient claim that well-being as the highest prudential good – eudaimonia – consists of happiness in a virtuous life. The argument takes into account recent work on happiness, well-being, and virtue, and defends a neo-Aristotelian conception of virtue as an integrated intellectual-emotional disposition that is limited in both scope and stability. This conception of virtue is argued to be widely-held and compatible with social and cognitive psychology.

The main argument of the book is as follows: (i) the concept of well-being as the highest prudential good is internally coherent and widely held; (ii) well-being thus conceived requires an objectively worthwhile life; (iii) in turn, such a life requires autonomy and reality-orientation, i.e., a disposition to think for oneself, seek truth or understanding about important aspects of one’s own life and human life in general, and act on this understanding when circumstances permit; (iv) to the extent that someone is successful in achieving understanding and acting on it, she is realistic, and to the extent that she is realistic, she is virtuous; (v) hence, well-being as the highest prudential good requires virtue. But complete virtue is impossible for both psychological and epistemic reasons, and this is one reason why complete well-being is impossible.”

<sup>17</sup> “I examine here whether reliability is a defining feature of (moral or intellectual) virtues. I argue (1) that reliability is *not* a defining feature of a virtue where virtues are conceived (as they often are) as “personal excellences,” but (2) that there is another (also intuitive and familiar) conception of a virtue according to which reliability *is* a defining feature. I also argue (3) that even on the former conception, a certain rational *belief* pertaining to reliability is essential and (4) that reliability itself, while not a defining feature of a virtue thus conceived, nevertheless is a concomitant of it.”

- 1992 [58] Baier, Annette (1992): Some Virtues of Resident Alienage, in *Virtue (Nomos 34)*, hrsg. von John W. Chapman und William A. Galston, New York, S. 291–308.
- 1988 [59] Baier, Kurt (1988): Radical Virtue Ethics, in *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* Vol. XIII: *Ethical Theory: Character and Virtue*, hrsg. von Peter A. French, Theodore E. Uehling, Jr. und Howard K. Wettstein, Notre Dame, S. 126–35.
- 2010 [60] Bailey, Olivia (2010): What Knowledge is Necessary for Virtue?, *Journal of Ethics and Social Philosophy* 4 (2), S. 1–17.<sup>19</sup>
- 2016 [61] Baker, Jennifer A./White, Mark D. (Hrsg.) (2016): *Economics and the Virtues. Building a New Moral Foundation*, Oxford.
- 1998 [62] Barcalow, Emmett (1998): *Moral Philosophy. Theories and Issues*, Belmont, CA, 2. Auflage, S. 98–124 (“The Good Person: Virtue and Vice”).
- 1985 [63] Baron, M. (1985): Varieties of Ethics of Virtue, *American Philosophical Quarterly* 22, S. 47–53.
- 2014 [64] Bashour, Bana (2014): Can I Be a Good Animal. A Naturalized Account of Virtue Ethics, in *Contemporary Philosophical Naturalism and Its Implications*, hrsg. von Bana Bashour und Hans D. Muller, New York und London, S. 182–193.
- 2013 [65] Bassham, Gregory (2013): Virtue-Centered Approaches to Education: Prospects and Pitfalls, in *Virtues in Action. New Essays in Applied Virtue Ethics*, hrsg. von Michael W. Austin, Houndmills, Basingstoke, S. 11–22.
- 2022 [66] Bassham, Gregory/Ostrowski, Olivia (2022): A Pluralistic Virtue-Centered Theory of Judging, *Ratio Juris* 35, S. 3–20.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> “Against the background of a great deal of structural symmetry between intellectual and moral virtue and vice, it is a surprising fact that what is arguably the central or paradigm moral vice – that is, moral malevolence or malevolence proper – has no obvious or well-known counterpart among the intellectual vices. The notion of “epistemic malevolence” makes no appearance on any standard list of intellectual vices; nor is it central to our ordinary ways of thinking about intellectual vice. In this essay, I argue that there is such a thing as epistemic malevolence and offer an account of its basic character and structure. Doing so requires a good deal of attention to malevolence simpliciter. In the final section of the essay, I offer an explanation of our relative unfamiliarity with this trait.”

<sup>19</sup> “Critics contend that Aristotelianism demands too much of the virtuous person in the way of knowledge to be credible. This general charge is usually directed against either of two of Aristotelianism’s apparent claims about the necessary conditions for the possession of a single virtue, namely that 1) one must know what all the other virtues require, and 2) one must also be the master of a preternatural range of technical/empirical knowledge. I argue that Aristotelianism does indeed have a very high standard when it comes to the knowledge necessary for the full possession of a virtue, in both of these respects. However, focus on the necessary conditions for full virtue tends to obscure an important fact: some kinds of knowledge are much more important to various virtues than others are. A proper appreciation of the significance of this fact will go a long way toward answering critics’ worries about Aristotelianism’s knowledge requirements.”

<sup>20</sup> “Though first proposed more than two decades ago, virtue jurisprudence — broadly, the attempt to apply the insights and perspectives of virtue ethics to law and legal theory — has failed to gain much traction in the legal academy. This is partly due, we suggest, to the dominance of traditionalist neo- Aristotelian

- 2018 [67] Bates, Tom/Kleingeld, Pauline (2018): Virtue, Vice, and Situationism, in *The Oxford Handbook of Virtue*, hrsg. von Nancy E. Snow, Oxford, S. 524–45.
- 2010 [68] Battaly, Heather (2010): Introduction: Virtue and Vice, *Metaphilosophy* 41 (Special Issue: Virtue and Vice, Moral And Epistemic), S. 1–21.<sup>21</sup>
- 2010 [69] Battaly, Heather (2010): Epistemic Self-Indulgence, *Metaphilosophy* 41, S. 214–34.<sup>22</sup>
- 2015 [70] Battaly, Heather (2015): *Virtue*, Cambridge.<sup>23</sup>

---

approaches to virtue jurisprudence — most notably in the work of Lawrence Solum, the most prominent theoretical architect and de-fender of virtue jurisprudence. In this paper, we sketch in broad strokes an alternative form of virtue jurisprudence — a pluralistic virtue- centered approach — and explain how it might work, particularly in the field of constitutional adjudication. Such an approach, we argue, has major advantages over prevailing neo- Aristotelian models, and may well have wider appeal.”

<sup>21</sup> “This introduction to the collection Virtue and Vice, Moral and Epistemic addresses three main questions: (1) What is a virtue theory in ethics or epistemology? (2) What is a virtue? and (3) What is a vice? (1) It suggests that a virtue theory takes the virtues and vices of agents to be more fundamental than evaluations of acts or beliefs, and defines right acts or justified beliefs in terms of the virtues. (2) It argues that there are two important but different concepts of virtue: virtues are qualities that attain good ends, and virtues are qualities that involve good motives. (3) Accordingly, vices are qualities that either fail to attain good ends or involve bad motives. Finally, the introduction summarizes the eleven essays in the collection, which are divided into four sections: the Structure of Virtue Ethics and Virtue Epistemology; Virtue and Context; Virtue and Emotion; and Virtues and Vices.”

<sup>22</sup> “I argue in this essay that there is an epistemic analogue of moral self-indulgence. Section 1 analyzes Aristotle’s notion of moral temperance, and its corresponding vices of self-indulgence and insensibility. Section 2 uses Aristotle’s notion of moral self-indulgence as a model for epistemic self-indulgence. I argue that one is epistemically self-indulgent only if one either: (ESI1) desires, consumes, and enjoys appropriate and inappropriate epistemic objects; or (ESI2) desires, consumes, and enjoys epistemic objects at appropriate and inappropriate times; or (ESI3) desires and enjoys epistemic objects too frequently, or to an inappropriately high degree, or consumes too much of them. We need not look far to locate the epistemically self-indulgent: philosophers, especially skeptics, are likely candidates.”

<sup>23</sup> Acknowledgements vii. 1 What Are the Virtues? 1.1 A Working Definition of Virtue. 1.2 Two Key Concepts of Virtue. 1.3 Must We Choose between the Two Key Concepts? 1.4 Why Would We Care about the Virtues. 2 Ends Matter: Virtues Attain Good Ends or Effects. 2.1 Virtues Attain Good Ends: The Teleological Variety. 2.2 Virtues Attain Good Effects: The Nonteleological Variety. 2.3 Luck in Getting Ends or Effects. 3 Motives Matter: Virtue Require Good Motives. 3.1 Virtues Require Good Motives-and-Actions, but Attaining Good Ends? 3.2 Virtues Require Good Motives-Actions-and-Attaining-Good-Ends? 3.3 Virtues Require Good Motives-and-Actions-but-not-Attaining-Good-Ends. 3.4 Objections. 4 Vice and Failures of Virtue. 4.1 Ends Matter: Vice Attain Bad Ends or Effects. 4.2 Motives Matter: Vices Require Bad Motives. 4.3 Weakness of Will and Vice. 4.4 Self-Control and Virtue. 5 Virtue, Right Action, and Knowledge. 5.1 Components of the Virtues. 5.2 Are Components of Moral Virtue Necessary and Sufficient for Right Action? 5.3 Are Components of Intellectual Virtue Necessary and Sufficient for Knowledge? 6 Virtue and Living Well. 6.1 Living Well: some Parameters. 6.2 Living Well: The Main Accounts. 6.3 Is Virtue Sufficient for Living Well? 6.4 Is Virtue Necessary for Living Well? 7 How Can We Acquire the Virtues? 7.1 Habituation. 7.2 Objections. 7.3 Strategies for Acquiring Intellectual Virtues in University Classrooms. Notes. References. Index.

- 2016 [71] Battaly, Heather (2016): Developing Virtue and Rehabilitating Vice: Worries about Self-cultivation and Self-reform, *Journal of Moral Education* 45, S. 207–22.<sup>24</sup>
- 1997 [72] Baur, Michael (Hrsg.) (1997): *Virtues and Virtue Theories*, Washington, D.C: Catholic Univ. of America Press (Proceedings of the American Catholic Philosophical Association 71).
- 2007 [73] Baxley, Anne Margaret (2007): The Price of Virtue, *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* 88, S. 40–23.<sup>25</sup>
- 1994 [74] Beauchamp, Tom L./Childress, James F. (1994): *Principles of Biomedical Ethics*, New York, Oxford, 4. Aufl., S. 62–69 (“Character Ethics: Virtue-Based Theory”).
- 1975 [75] Becker, Lawrence C. (1975): The Neglect of Virtue, *Ethics* 85, S. 110–22.<sup>26</sup>
- 1990 [76] Becker, Lawrence C. (1990): Unity, Coincidence and Conflict in the Virtues, *Philosophia* 20, S. 127–43.<sup>27</sup>

---

<sup>24</sup> “Aristotelian virtue theorists have emphasized the role of the self in developing virtue and in rehabilitating vice. But this article argues that, as Aristotelians, we have placed too much emphasis on self-cultivation and self-reform. Self-cultivation is not required for developing virtue or vice. Nor will *sophia*-inspired self-reform jumpstart change in the vicious person. In each case, the external environment has an important role to play. One can unwittingly acquire virtues or vices from one’s environment. Likewise, a well-designed environment may be the key ingredient for jumpstarting change in the vicious person. Self-cultivation and late-stage self-reform are not ruled out, but the role of the self in character development and rehabilitation is not as exalted as we might have thought.”

<sup>25</sup> “Aristotle famously held that there is a crucial difference between the person who merely acts rightly and the person who is wholehearted in what she does. He captures this contrast by insisting on a distinction between continence and full virtue. One way of accounting for the important difference here is to suppose that, for the genuinely virtuous person, the requirements of virtue “silence” competing reasons for action. I argue that the silencing interpretation is not compelling. As Aristotle rightly saw, virtue can have a cost, and a mark of the wise person is that she recognizes it.”

<sup>26</sup> “Modern moral philosophy has generally neglected the concept of virtue as one which should be central to moral theorizing. Some reasons for the neglect are mentioned; some sources of regret for the neglect are explained; and six illustrations of the usefulness of the concept of virtue in moral theorizing are developed in more detail: 1) On defining the good person; 2) On defining standards of performance; 3) On excuses; 4) On rescue vs preventive action; 5) On civil disobedience; 6) On torture, terrorism and strategic bombing. The point of the paper is not to argue that the concept of virtue should supplant the concepts of duty and value, but merely to show that there are good reasons for regretting its neglect, and good reasons for encouraging its development.” (<http://www.wm.edu/CAS/PHIL/Becker/lcb-bib.htm>)

<sup>27</sup> “The project in this paper is to argue for an ordinal account of the unity of the virtues in the following three steps: (1) The first is to show the importance of a neglected class of questions about coherence – questions that may be referred to as coincidence problems. It is important to see that even if a virtue theory can eliminate conflicts between traits, a large class of difficult practical problems is very likely to remain: namely, the problems that arise when two or more traits give the same guidance for conduct, but when we think only one of the traits should be controlling. (“Yes of course I wanted you to keep the promise. But because you wanted to, not because it was your duty.”) Call these cases coincidence problems. Love and duty often coincide for practical purposes – as often, probably, as they conflict. And the same is true of prudence and duty, and prudence and love. An account of the unity of the virtues that solves all the conflict problems but leaves these coincidence problems untouched is inadequate. Part of the agenda in this paper

- 1998 [77] Becker, Lawrence C. (1998): *A New Stoicism*, Princeton, NJ., S. 81–137 (“Virtue”).
- 2004 [78] Becker, Virtue Ethics, Applied Ethics and Rationality twenty-three years after *After Virtue*, *South African Journal of Philosophy* 23, S. 267–81.<sup>28</sup>
- 1998 [79] Benn, Piers (1998): *Ethics*, Montreal, S. 159–84 (“Virtue”).
- 1997 [80] Benner, Patricia (1997): A Dialogue Between Virtue Ethics and Care Ethics, *Theoretical Medicine* 18, S. 47–62.
- 1993 [81] Ben-Ze’ev, Aaron (1993): The Virtue of Modesty, *American Philosophical Quarterly* 30, S. 235–46.
- 2016 [82] Berger, Jacob/Alfano, Mark (2016): Virtue, Situationism, and the Cognitive Value of Art, *Monist* 99, S. 144–58.<sup>29</sup>

---

is to show that traditional accounts of the unity of the virtues are inadequate in just this way. (2) The second step in the argument is to organize conventional accounts of the unity of the virtues in a perspicuous way, and to show that they fail to solve coincidence problems. Arguments for the unity of the virtues typically do one of three things. a) One of these is to argue for the identity of the virtues: to argue that they are, at bottom, all the very same thing – a perfectly seamless whole in which there are ultimately no separate elements, and hence no conflicts or overlaps. b) A second sort of proposal is to argue for the organic unity of the virtues: to argue that they are all mutually compatible and connected parts of a whole – a perfectly harmonious whole in which, though there are genuinely distinct elements, there are no genuine conflicts. c) And a third strategy is to argue for the ordinal unity of the virtues: to argue that they are a perfectly ordered whole, unified in the sense that, given any conflict between traits, it will always be possible in theory to determine which one is primary -- which one is the “first virtue” in that circumstance. (3) The third step is to describe the sorts of ordinal accounts that are available, sketching the outlines of one organized around practical wisdom, and indicating how it would handle coherence questions of all sorts, including those of coincidence.”

(<http://www.wm.edu/CAS/PHIL/Becker/lcb-bib.htm>)

<sup>28</sup> “In evaluating the merits and short comings of virtue ethics I focus on some central differences between virtue ethics and rival theories such as deontology and utilitarianism. Virtue ethics does not prescribe strict rules of conduct. Instead, the virtue ethical approach can be understood as an invitation to search for standards, as opposed to strict rules, that ought to guide the conduct of our individual lives. This requires a particular method. The importance of this approach in present times will be come clear when we investigate the relation between virtue ethics and postmodernity. In our postmodern age moral concepts are no longer perceived as deriving their meaning from larger frameworks. Instead, their meanings are perceived as being derived from the contingencies that define our particular existences. Thus ongoing grass roots moral engagement is required, and virtue ethics is the appropriate moral frame work for doing this. This results in a broadening of rationality insofar as the full richness of our situated lives are factored into our accounts of rationality. At the same time virtue ethics prevents relativism, mainly because it does justice to the social embeddedness of human activities. In order to illustrate the virtue ethical approach I will discuss two key concepts in our moral vocabulary: responsibility and integrity. We will see how these basic concepts can be properly understood only if one takes into consideration the contingencies, inherent paradoxes and tensions in human life.”

<sup>29</sup> “Virtue-based moral cognitivism holds that at least some of the value of some art consists in conveying knowledge about the nature of virtue and vice. We explore here a challenge to this view, which extends the

- 2007 [83] Berges, Sandrine (2007): *Virtue Ethics, Politics, and the Function of Laws: The Parent Analogy in Plato's Menexenus*, *Dialogue* 46, S. 211–30.<sup>30</sup>
- 2015 [84] Berges, Sandrine (2015): *A Feminist Perspective on Virtue Ethics*, Houndmills, Basingstroke.
- 1999 [85] Berkowitz, Peter (1999): *Virtue and the Making of Modern Liberalism*, Princeton und Oxford.
- 2008 [86] Besser-Jones, Lorraine (2008): Social Psychology, Moral Character, and Moral Fallibility, *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 76, S. 310–32.<sup>31</sup>
- 2012 [87] Besser-Jones, Lorraine (2012): The Motivational State of the Virtuous Agent, *Philosophical Psychology* 25, S. 93–108.<sup>32</sup>
- 2003 [88] Birnbacher, Dieter (2003): *Analytische Einführung in die Ethik*, Berlin, S. 203–6 („Tugendethik“).

---

so-called situationist challenge to virtue ethics. Evidence from social psychology indicates that individuals' behavior is often susceptible to trivial and normatively irrelevant situational influences. This evidence not only challenges approaches to ethics that emphasize the role of virtue but also undermines versions of moral cognitivism, because the value of art cannot consist in teaching us about traits that do not exist. We thus recommend a new account of the cognitive value of art: art teaches how context and character interact to produce action."

<sup>30</sup> "Can virtue ethics say anything worthwhile about laws? What would a virtue-ethical account of good laws look like? I argue that a plausible answer to that question can be found in Plato's parent analogies in the *Crito* and the *Menexenus*. I go on to show that the *Menexenus* gives us a philosophical argument to the effect that laws are just only if they enable citizens to flourish. I then argue that the resulting virtue-ethical account of just laws is not viciously paternalistic. Finally, I refute the objection that the virtue-ethical account I am proposing is not distinct from a consequentialist account."

<sup>31</sup> "In recent years, there has been considerable debate in the literature concerning the existence of moral character. One lesson we should take away from these debates is that the concept of character, and the role it plays in guiding our actions, is far more complex than most of us initially took it to be. Just as Gilbert Harman, for example, makes a serious mistake in insisting, plain and simply, that there is no such thing as character, defenders of character also make a mistake to the extent that they imply there is no problem raised by the psychological literature for either the concept of character or the nature of character-based ethics. My hope for this paper is to avoid both of these mistakes by first, exploring exactly what is the concept of character that is so firmly rooted in our philosophical and everyday thinking; and second, exploring the implications of the psychological literature for this appropriately understood concept of character. In so doing, I will come to a resolution that vindicates the existence of character, while at the same time calls attention to the real and serious problem suggested by the psychological evidence. This, we will see, is a problem of moral motivation."

<sup>32</sup> "Julia Annas argues that Aristotle's understanding of the phenomenological experience of the virtuous agent corresponds to psychologist Mihaly Csikszentmihalyi's concept of the "flow," which is a form of intrinsic motivation. In this paper, I explore whether or not Annas' understanding of virtuous agency is a plausible one. After a thorough analysis of psychological accounts of intrinsic and extrinsic states of motivation, I argue that despite the attractiveness of Annas' understanding of virtuous agency, it is subject to a serious problem: all virtuous activities are not ones that we take pleasure in independently of their connection to "virtue." Moreover, somewhat sadly, we have no compelling reason to think that they can become so. Our psychology is not constituted to find the exercise of virtue, in all of its extensions, interesting and enjoyable, apart from its connection to virtue."

- 2016 [89] Birondo, Noell (2016): Virtue and Prejudice: Giving and Taking Reasons, *Monist* 99, S. 212–23.<sup>33</sup>
- 2014 [90] Bloomfield, Paul (2014): *The Virtues of Happiness. A Theory of the Good Life*, Oxford.<sup>34</sup>
- 2022 [91] Bloomfield, Paul (2022): Virtues and Excellences, *Ratio* 35, S. 49–60.<sup>35</sup>
- 1994 [92] Blum, Lawrence A. (1994): Virtue and Community, in ders., *Moral Perception and Particularity*, Cambridge, S. 144–69.
- 1996 [93] Blum, Lawrence A. (1996): Community and Virtue, in *How Should One Live? Essays on the Virtues*, hrsg. von Roger Crisp, Oxford, S. 231–50.
- 2016 [94] Blumenthal-Barby, J. S. (2016): Dilemmas for the Rarity Thesis in Virtue Ethics and Virtue Epistemology, *Philosophia* 44, S. 395–406.<sup>36</sup>

---

<sup>33</sup> “The most long-standing criticism of virtue ethics in its traditional, eudaimonistic variety centers on its apparently foundational appeal to nature in order to provide a source of normativity. This paper argues that a failure to appreciate both the giving and taking of reasons in sustaining an ethical outlook can distort a proper understanding of the available options for this traditional version of virtue ethics. To insist only on giving reasons, without also taking (maybe even considering) the reasons provided by others, displays a sadly illiberal form of prejudice. The paper finds and criticizes such a distortion in Jesse Prinz’s recent discussion of the “Normativity Challenge” to Aristotelian virtue ethics, thus highlighting a common tendency that we can helpfully move beyond.”

<sup>34</sup> Acknowledgments. Introduction. Chapter I: Getting Our Bearings. 1. The Problem. 2. The Diagnosis. 3. The Solution. 4. Common Dialectical Ground. 5. The Argument from Ontology. 6. The Argument from Epistemology. 7. Objections and Conclusion. Chapter II: Becoming Good. 1. The Paradox of Happiness. 2. The Most Important Thing in the World. 3. Taking Care of Yourself. 4. Beyond the Paradox of Happiness. 5. Developmental Practical Rationality. 6. Immorality as Immaturity. Chapter III: Why It’s Good To Be Good. 1. Human Nature and the Good Life. 2. Pleasure, Mood, and Self-Fulfillment. 3. Virtue. 4. Courage: Managing Danger. 5. Justice: Judging Fairly. 6. Temperance: Tempering Mettle. 7. Virtue, Luck, and Happiness. 8. Benefits of Morality. 9. Love is its Own Reward. 10. Wisdom. Bibliography. Index.

<sup>35</sup> “One of the few points of unquestioned agreement in virtue theory is that the virtues are supposed to be excellences. One way to understand this is to claim that the virtues always yield correct moral action and that we cannot be “too virtuous”: the virtues cannot be had in excess or “to a fault”. If we take this seriously, however, it yields the surprising conclusion that many traits which have been traditionally thought of as “virtues” fail to make the grade. The most prominent solution to the problem, reminiscent of Aristotle’s view, is found to generate more problems than it solves.”

<sup>36</sup> “‘Situationists’ such as Gilbert Harman and John Doris have accused virtue ethicists as having an ‘empirically inadequate’ theory, arguing that much of social science research suggests that people do not have robust character traits (e.g., virtues or vices) as traditionally thought. By far, the most common response to this challenge has been what I refer to as ‘the rarity response’ or the ‘rarity thesis’. Rarity responders (such as Ernest Sosa and Gopal Sreenivasan) deny that situationism poses any sort of threat to virtue ethics since there is no reason to suppose that the moral virtues are typical or widespread. But, far from being its saving grace, I will argue, the rarity thesis forces virtue ethicists into positions that are incompatible with their theoretical foundations or render their theory normatively irrelevant. The more the virtue ethicists modify their thesis to fit the empirical evidence and to be normatively relevant, the less they retain a virtue ethical theory. This is also the case for virtue epistemologists.”

- 2021 [95] Bobier, Christopher A. (2021): What Would the Virtuous Person Eat? The Case for Virtuous Omnivorism, *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics* 34:19, S. 1–19.<sup>37</sup>
- 1996 [96] Bond, E. J. (1996): *Ethics and Human Well-being. An Introduction to Moral Philosophy*, Oxford, S. 135–64.
- 2001 [97] Borchers, Dagmar (2001): *Die neue Tugendethik – Schritt zurück im Zorn?*, Paderborn.
- 2008 [98] Borchers, Dagmar (2008): Moralische Exzellenz – Einführung in die Tugendethik, in *Grundkurs Ethik. Band 1: Grundlagen*, hrsg. von Johannes S. Ach, Kurt Bayertz und Ludwig Siep, Paderborn, S. 33–48.
- 2007 [99] Borden, Sandra L. (2007): *Journalism as Practice: MacIntyre, Virtue Ethics and the Press*, Aldershot.<sup>38</sup>
- 2021 [100] Boyd, Craig A./Timpe, Kevin (2021): *The Virtues. A Very Short Introduction*, Oxford.
- 2005 [101] Bradely, Ben (2005): Virtue Consequentialism, *Utilitas* 17, S. 282–98.<sup>39</sup>
- 2018 [102] Bradely, Ben (2018): Contemporary Consequentialist Theories of Virtue, in *The Oxford Handbook*

---

<sup>37</sup> “Would the virtuous person eat animals? According to some ethicists, the answer is a resounding no, at least for the virtuous person living in an affluent society. The virtuous person cares about animal suffering, and so, she will not contribute to practices that involve animal suffering when she can easily adopt a strict plant-based diet. The virtuous person is temperate, and temperance involves not indulging in unhealthy diets, which include diets that incorporate animals. Moreover, it is unjust for an animal to be killed for food when this is unnecessary. By contrast, I argue that the virtuous person in an affluent society would eat animals, at least sometimes. I explain how the very virtues thought to motivate “virtuous modest veganism”—compassion, temperance, and justice—motivate the virtuous person to consume some animals.”

<sup>38</sup> “The process of turning the news into just another product has been going on since at least the nineteenth century. But this process of commodification has accelerated since a few, publicly owned conglomerates have come to dominate the global media market. The emphasis on the bottom line has resulted in newsroom budget cuts and other business strategies that seriously endanger good journalism. Meanwhile, the growing influence of the Internet and partisan commentary has led even journalists themselves to question their role. In this book, Sandra L. Borden analyzes the ethical bind of public-minded journalists using Alasdair MacIntyre’s account of a ‘practice’. She suggests that MacIntyre’s framework helps us to see how journalism is normatively defined by the pursuit of goods appropriate to its purpose – and how money and other ‘external’ goods threaten that pursuit. Borden argues that developing and promoting the kind of robust group identity implied by the idea of a practice can help journalism better withstand the moral challenges posed by commodification. This book applies MacIntyre’s virtue theory to journalism with philosophical rigor, and at the same time is informed by the most current thinking from communication and other disciplines, including organizational studies and sociology.”

<sup>39</sup> “Virtue consequentialism has been held by many prominent philosophers, but has never been properly formulated. I criticize Julia Driver’s formulation of virtue consequentialism and offer an alternative. I maintain that according to the best version of virtue consequentialism, attributions of virtue are really disguised comparisons between two character traits, and the consequences of a trait in non-actual circumstances may affect its actual status as a virtue or vice. Such a view best enables the consequentialist to account for moral luck, unexemplified virtues, and virtues and vices involving the prevention of goodness and badness.”

of *Virtue*, hrsg. von Nancy E. Snow, Oxford, S. 398–412.

- 2004 [103] Brady, Michael (2004): Against Agent-Based Virtue Ethics, *Philosophical Papers* 33, S. 1–10.<sup>40</sup>
- 2005 [104] Brady, Michael S. (2005): The Value of the Virtues, *Philosophical Studies* 125, S. 85–114.<sup>41</sup>
- 2010 [105] Brady, Michael S. (2010): Virtue, Emotion, and Attention, *Metaphilosophy* 41, S. 115–31.<sup>42</sup>
- 2018 [106] Brady, Michael S. (2018): Moral and Intellectual Virtues, in *The Oxford Handbook of Virtue*, hrsg. von Nancy E. Snow, Oxford, S. 783–99.
- 1981 [107] Brandt, Richard B. (1981): Frankena and Virtue Ethics, *Monist* 64, S. 271–92.
- 1988 [108] Brandt, Richard B. (1988): The Structure of Virtue, in *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* Vol. XIII: *Ethical Theory: Character and Virtue*, hrsg. von Peter A. French, Theodore E. Uehling, Jr. und Howard K. Wettstein, Notre Dame, S. 64–82. – Wiederabgedruckt in Brandt, *Morality, Utilitarianism, and Rights*, Cambridge 1992, S. 289–311.
- 2011 [109] Cafaro, Philip/Sandler, Ronald (Hrsg.) (2011): *Virtue Ethics and the Environment*, Berlin, New York 2011.<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup> “Agent-based virtue ethics is a unitary normative theory according to which the moral status of actions is entirely dependent upon the moral status of an agent’s motives and character traits. One of the problems any such approach faces is to capture the common-sense distinction between an agent’s doing the right thing, and her doing it for the right (or wrong) reason. In this paper I argue that agent-based virtue ethics ultimately fails to capture this kind of fine-grained distinction, and to this extent ought to be rejected. I focus first on Michael Slote’s agent-based theory, according to which the moral status of actions depends upon an agent’s actual motives, and argue that this leads to a paradox. I then consider whether the ‘counterfactual’ version of agent-basing favoured by Rosalind Hursthouse and Linda Zagzebski fares any better, and conclude that it does not.”

<sup>41</sup> “Direct theories of the virtues maintain that an explanation of why some virtuous trait counts as valuable should ultimately appeal to the value of its characteristic motive or aim. In this paper I argue that, if we take the idea of a direct approach to virtue theory seriously, we should favour a view according to which virtue involves *knowledge*. I raise problems for recent “agent-based” and “end-based” versions of the direct approach, show how my account proves preferable to these, and defend it against a number of objections.”

<sup>42</sup> “The perceptual model of emotions maintains that emotions involve, or are at least analogous to, perceptions of value. On this account, emotions purport to tell us about the evaluative realm, in much the same way that sensory perceptions inform us about the sensible world. An important development of this position, prominent in recent work by Peter Goldie amongst others, concerns the essential role that virtuous habits of attention play in enabling us to gain perceptual and evaluative knowledge. I think that there are good reasons to be sceptical about this picture of virtue. In this essay I set out these reasons, and explain the consequences this scepticism has for our understanding of the relation between virtue, emotion, and attention. In particular, I argue that our primary capacity for recognizing value is in fact a non-emotional capacity.”

<sup>43</sup> Editorial, Richard P. Haynes. – Environmental Virtue Ethics Special Issue: Introduction, Philip Cafaro. – Environmentalism and Public Virtue, Brian Treanor. – Forgiveness, Pessimism, and Environmental Citizenship, Kathryn J. Norlock. – Radical Hope for Living Well in a Warmer World, Allen Thompson. – Species Extinction and the Vice for Learning Virtue of Thoughtlessness: The Importance of Spiritual Exercises, Jeremy Bendik-Keymer. – The Virtue of Simplicity, Joshua Colt Gambrel and Philip Cafaro. – The

- 2006 [110] Brännmark, Johan (2006): From Virtue to Decency, *Metaphilosophy* 37, S. 589–604.<sup>44</sup>
- 1997 [111] Brickhouse, Thomas C./Smith, Nicholas D. (1997): Socrates and the Unity of the Virtues, *Journal of Ethics* 1, S. 311–24.
- 2016 [112] Brown, Étienne (2016): Aristotelian Virtue Ethics and the Normativity Challenge, *Dialogue* 55, S. 131–50.<sup>45</sup>
- 2004 [113] Brown, Stephen R. (2004): Naturalized Virtue Ethics and the Epistemological Gap, *Journal of Moral Philosophy* 1, S. 197–209.
- 2008 [114] Brown, Stephen R. (2008): *Moral Virtue and Nature: A Defense of Ethical Naturalism*, London.<sup>46</sup>
- 2002 [115] Brumlik, Micha (2002): *Bildung und Glück. Versuch einer Theorie der Tugenden*, Berlin, Wien.<sup>47</sup>

---

Epistemic Demands of Environmental Virtue, Jason Kawall. – Hume’s Knave and Nonanthropocentric Virtues, Paul Haught. – Heideggerian Environmental Virtue Ethics, Christine Swanton. – Ethical Theory and the Problem of Inconsequentialism: Why Environmental Ethicists Should be Virtue-Oriented Ethicists, Ronald Sandler. – Patriotism as an Environmental Virtue, Philip Cafaro.

Previously published in the *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics* 23 (2010).

<sup>44</sup> “In her work on virtue ethics Rosalind Hursthouse has formulated an Aristotelian criterion of rightness that understands rightness in terms of what the virtuous person would do. It is argued here that this kind of criterion does not allow enough room for the category of the supererogatory and that right and wrong should rather be understood in terms of the characteristic behavior of decent persons. Furthermore, it is suggested that this kind of approach has the added advantage of allowing one to make sense of the centrality of negative precepts in commonsense morality.”

<sup>45</sup> “Aristotelian virtue theorists are currently engaged in a discussion with philosophers who use psychological findings to question some of their main assumptions. In this article, I present and argue against one of these psychological challenges—Jesse Prinz’s Normativity Challenge—which rests on the claim that findings in cultural psychology contradict the Aristotelian thesis that the normativity of virtues derives from nature. First, I demonstrate that the Normativity Challenge is based on three problematic assumptions about contemporary Aristotelianism. Second, I argue that it presupposes the truth of a metaethical framework that Aristotelians reject: moral relativism.”

<sup>46</sup> Table of Contents: Acknowledgements. 1. Ethical Naturalism. 2. Natural Teleology. 3. Good Human Beings. 4. Facts and values. 5. Moral Virtue and Nature. Works Cited.

“What makes someone a good human being? Is there an objective answer to this question, an answer that can be given in naturalistic terms? For ages philosophers have attempted to develop some sort of naturalistic ethics. Against ethical naturalism, however, notable philosophers have contended that such projects are impossible, due to the existence of some sort of ‘gap’ between facts and values. Others have suggested that teleology, upon which many forms of ethical naturalism depend, is an outdated metaphysical concept.

This book argues that a good human being is one who has those traits the possession of which enables someone to achieve those ends natural to beings like us. Thus, the answer to the question of what makes a good human being is given in terms both objective and naturalistic. The author shows that neither ‘is-ought’ gaps, nor objections concerning teleology pose insurmountable problems for naturalistic virtue ethics. This work is a much needed contribution to the ongoing debate about ethical theory and ethical virtue.”

<sup>47</sup> Inhalt: Vorbemerkung 7 Einleitung: Moralische Gefühle und Die Leichtigkeit des Seins 9 I. Menschliche Natur und Tugendethik 29 II. Skizze einer Theorie des Lasters 57 III. Vertrauen und Scham – Grundzüge einer

- 2005 [116] Cafaro, Philip/Sandler, Ronald (Hrsg.) (2005): *Environmental Virtue Ethics*, Lanham.<sup>48</sup>
- 2007 [117] Calder, Todd (2007): Against Consequentialist Theories of Virtue and Vice, *Utilitas* 19, S. 201–19.<sup>49</sup>
- 2008 [118] Calhoun, Cheshire (2008): Reflections on the Metavirtue of Sensitivity to Suffering, *Hypatia* 23, S. 182–88. – Zu [627].
- 1994 [119] Callan, E. (1994): Impartiality and Virtue, *Journal of Value Inquiry* 28, S. 401–14.
- 2004 [120] Card, Robert F. (2004): Pure Aretaic Ethics and Character, *Journal of Value Inquiry* 38, S. 473–84.
- 2006 [121] Carden, Stephen D. (2006): *Virtue Ethics: Dewey and MacIntyre*, London.
- 1985 [122] Carr, David (1985): Two Kinds of Virtue, *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 85 (1984–5), S. 47–61.
- 2003 [123] Carr, David (2003): Character and Moral Choice in the Cultivation of Virtue, *Philosophy* 78, S. 219–32.<sup>50</sup>

---

Theorie moralischer Gefühle 65 IV. Evolution, Altruismus und Moral 82 V. Die Leidenschaft der Pädagogik 102 VI. Glück und Lebenslauf 115 VII. Humanontogenese und der Sinn des Lebens 128 VIII. Tugend und Charakter 143 IX. Die Tugenden 149 Gerechtigkeit 151 Mut 156 Mäßigung und Besonnenheit 167 Hoffnung 181 Glaube 197 Liebe 204 X. Freundschaft 241 XI. Tugend und demokratischer Charakter 258 XII. Toleranz – Tugend der Citoyens? 281 Bibliographische Notiz 287 Anmerkungen.

<sup>48</sup> Contents: *Part One: Recognizing Environmental Virtue Ethics*: Introduction: Environmental Virtue Ethics (Ronald Sandler), The Emergence of Ecological Virtue Language (Louke van Wensveen), Thoreau, Leopold, and Carson: Toward an Environmental Virtue Ethics (Philip Cafaro). *Part Two: Environmental Virtue Ethics Theory*: Ideals of Human Excellence and Preserving Natural Environments (Thomas Hill, Jr.), Environmental Virtue Ethics: Half the Truth but Dangerous as a Whole (Holmes Rolston, III), Virtue Ethics as Foundational for a Global Ethic (Laura Westra), A Virtue Ethics Approach to Aldo Leopold's Land Ethic (Bill Shaw), Virtue Ethics and Repugnant Conclusions (David Schmidtz and Matt Zwolinski), *Part Three: Environmental Virtues And Vices*: Benevolence as an Environmental Virtue (Geoffrey Frasz), Gluttony, Arrogance, Greed and Apathy: An Exploration of Environmental Vice (Philip Cafaro), Religion and Environmental Virtue (Charles Taliaferro), Cardinal Environmental Virtues (Louke van Wensveen), *Part Four: The Application Of Environmental Virtue*: Synergistic Environmental Virtues: Consumerism and Human Flourishing (Peter Wenz), A Virtue Ethics Perspective on Genetically Modified Crops (Ronald Sandler)

<sup>49</sup> "Consequentialist theories of virtue and vice, such as the theories of Jeremy Bentham and Julia Driver, characterize virtue and vice in terms of the consequential, or instrumental, properties of these character traits. There are two problems with theories of this sort. First they imply that, under the right circumstances, paradigmatic virtues, such as benevolence, are vices and paradigmatic vices, such as maliciousness, are virtues. This is conceptually problematic. Second, they say nothing about the intrinsic nature of the virtues and vices, which is less than we could hope for from a theory of virtue and vice. Thus, we have reason to reject consequentialist theories in favour of theories that characterize virtue and vice in terms of the intrinsic properties of these character traits. Aristotle and Thomas Hurka have theories this sort."

<sup>50</sup> "It is central to virtue ethics both that morally sound action follows from virtuous character, and that virtuous character is itself the product of habitual right judgement and choice: that, in short, we choose our moral characters. However, any such view may appear to encounter difficulty in those cases of moral

- 2009 [124] Carr, David (2009): Virtue, Mixed Emotions and Moral Ambivalence, *Philosophy* 84, S. 31–46.<sup>51</sup>
- 2018 [125] Carr, David (2018): Virtue Ethics and Education, in *The Oxford Handbook of Virtue*, hrsg. von Nancy E. Snow, Oxford, S. 640–58.
- 1999 [126] Carr, David/Steutel, Jan (Hrsg.) (1999): *Virtue Ethics and Moral Education*, London.
- 1990 [127] Casey, John (1990): *Pagan Virtue. An Essay in Ethics*, Oxford.
- 1997 [128] Cates, Diana Fritz (1997): *Choosing to Feel: Virtue, Friendship, and Compassion for Friends*, Notre Dame, Ind.
- 2021 [129] Chappell, Sophie Grace (2021): To Live Outside the Law You Must Be Honest, *Aristotelian Society Supplementary Volume* 95, S. 233–52. – Zu [494].
- 2006 [130] Chappell, Timothy (2006): The Variety of Life and the Unity of Practical Wisdom, in *Values and Virtues: Aristotelianism in Contemporary Ethics*, hrsg. von Timothy Chappell, Oxford, S. 136–57.
- 2009 [131] Chappell, Timothy (2009): *Ethics and Experience. Life Beyond Moral Theory*, Montreal, S. 97–124 (“Virtue Ethics”).
- 2013 [132] Chappell, Timothy (2013): Virtue Ethics in the Twentieth Century, in *Cambridge Companion to Virtue Ethics*, hrsg. von Daniel C. Russell, Cambridge, S. 149–71.
- 2006 [133] Chappell, Timothy (Hrsg.) (2006): *Values and Virtues: Aristotelianism in Contemporary Ethics*, Oxford.<sup>52</sup>

---

conflict where an agent cannot simultaneously act (say) both honestly and sympathetically, and in which the choices of agents seem to favour the construction of different moral characters. This paper argues, against possible counter-arguments, for a view of virtue ethics which embraces the diversity of moral character.”

<sup>51</sup> “Aristotelian virtue ethics invests emotions and feelings with much moral significance. However, the moral and other conflicts that inevitably beset human life often give rise to states of emotional division and ambivalence with problematic implications for any understanding of virtue as complete psychic unity of character and conduct. For one thing, any admission that the virtuous are prey to conflicting passions and desires may seem to threaten the crucial virtue ethical distinction between the virtuous and the continent. One recent attempt to sustain this distinction – considered in this paper – maintains that the contrary-to-virtue emotions and desires of the virtuous (by contrast with those of the continent) must relinquish their motive power as reasons for action. Following some attention to the psychological status of feelings and emotions – in particular their complex relations with cognition and reason – this paper rejects this solution in favour of a more constructive view of emotional conflict.”

<sup>52</sup> Contents: Introduction, Timothy Chappell. 1. Modern virtue ethics, Christopher Coope. 2. The admirable life and the desirable life, Linda Zagzebski. 3. Virtue and rights in Aristotle’s best regime, Fred Miller. 4. The virtues and vices of virtue jurisprudence, Antony Duff. 5. Habituation as *mimēsis*, Hallvard Fossheim. 6. Moral incompetence, Adam Morton. 7. The variety of life and the unity of practical wisdom, Timothy Chappell. 8. Moral sense and virtue in Hume’s ethics, Paul Russell. 9. Can Nietzsche be both a virtue ethicist and an existentialist?, Christine Swanton. 10. Manners, morals, and practical wisdom, Karen Stohr. 11. The hardboiled detective as moralist, Sandrine Berges. 12. ‘Like the Bloom on Youths’: How pleasure completes

- 1992 [134] Chapman, John W./Galston, William A. (Hrsg.) (1992): *Virtue (Nomos 34)*, New York.
- 2009 [135] Christensen, Anne-Marie S. (2009): Getting It Right in Ethical Experience: John McDowell and Virtue Ethics, *Journal of Value Inquiry* 43, S. 493–506.
- 2018 [136] Cimino, Chapin (2018): Virtue Jurisprudence, in *The Oxford Handbook of Virtue*, hrsg. von Nancy E. Snow, Oxford, S. 621–39.
- 2014 [137] Ciurria, Michelle (2014): Answering the Situationist Challenge. A Defense of Virtue Ethics as Preferable to Other Ethical Theories, *Dialogue* 53, S. 651–70.<sup>53</sup>
- 2019 [138] Clancy, Sean (2019): Virtue and the Problem of Conceptualization, *Philosophers' Imprint* 19, No. 22, S. 1–18.<sup>54</sup>
- 2002 [139] Crowther, Paul (2002): Narrative and Self-Consciousness: A Basis for Virtue Ethics, *Journal of Value Inquiry* 36, S. 435–43.
- 1998 [140] Churchland, Paul M. (1998): Toward a Cognitive Neurobiology of the Moral Virtues, *Topoi* 17, S. 83–96.
- 2012 [141] Ciurria, Michelle (2012): A New Mixed View of Virtue Ethics, Based on Daniel Doviak's New Virtue Calculus, *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* 15, S. 259–69.<sup>55</sup> – Zu [186].

---

our lives, Johan Braennmark. 13. Mixed determinates: pleasure, good, and truth, Theodore Scaltsas. 14. Three dogmas of desire, Talbot Brewer.

<sup>53</sup> "In a well-known paper, John Doris argues that situationist psychology impugns Aristotelian virtue ethics, which presupposes the existence of stable, situation-independent virtues. Maria Merritt responds that a Humean conception of virtue, which is situation-dependent, is immune to this criticism. However, she does not directly address two of Doris' more trenchant objections, which he presents in the form of a dilemma. In this paper, I respond to Doris' dilemma, using recent research in psychology and cognitive science to show that virtue ethics, as a dispositionalist, non-codifiable theory, represents a more empirically adequate moral psychology than the leading alternatives."

<sup>54</sup> "According to an influential family of views, agents are virtuous when and because they possess the correct attitudes towards the actual good and bad. But there are multiple ways of conceptualizing the actual good and bad, and attitudes towards some conceptualizations of the good and bad seem to be irrelevant to moral character. It is deceptively difficult to provide a theoretical rationale for distinguishing between those conceptualizations of the good and bad that seem to be relevant and those that do not: I argue that a previous attempt to provide such a rationale fails, as do a number of seemingly promising alternatives. This problem merits further attention not only because it shows that certain theoretical accounts of character are incomplete, but because it is likely to interfere with our ability to evaluate certain real-world agents, who care about the actual good conceptualized in certain ways but not in others. Since a generalized version of the problem of conceptualization also affects other intrinsic accounts of virtue and vice, I argue that we must either solve this problem or abandon such accounts."

<sup>55</sup> "In *A New Form of Agent-Based Virtue Ethics*, Daniel Doviak develops a novel agent-based theory of right action that treats the rightness (or deontic status) of an action as a matter of the action's net intrinsic virtue value (net-IVV)—that is, its balance of virtue over vice. This view is designed to accommodate three basic tenets of commonsense morality: (i) the maxim that "ought" implies "can," (ii) the idea that a person can do the right thing for the wrong reason, and (iii) the idea that a virtuous person can have "mixed motives." In this paper, I argue that Doviak's account makes an important contribution to agent-based virtue ethics, but

- 2014 [142] Ciurria, Michelle (2014): Answering the Situationist Challenge: A Defense of Virtue Ethics as Preferable to Other Ethical Theories, *Dialogue* 53, S. 651–70.<sup>56</sup>
- 2009 [143] Clark, Dale L. (2009): Aesop's Fox: Consequentialist Virtue Meets Egocentric Bias, *Philosophical Psychology* 22, S. 727–37.<sup>57</sup>
- 2010 [144] Clarke, Bridget (2010): Virtue and Disagreement, *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* 13, S. 273–91.<sup>58</sup>
- 2018 [145] Clarke, Bridget (2018): Virtue as a Sensibility, in *The Oxford Handbook of Virtue*, hrsg. von Nancy E. Snow, Oxford, S. 35–56.
- 1990 [146] Clowney, D. (1990): Virtues, Rules and the Foundations of Ethics, *Philosophia* 20, S. 49–68.

---

it needs to be supplemented with a consequentialist account of the *efficacy* of well-motivated actions—that is, it should be transformed into a mixed (motives-consequences) account, while retaining its net-IVV calculus. This is because I believe that there are right-making properties *external* to an agent's psychology which it is important to take into account, especially when an agent's actions negatively affect other people. To incorporate this intuition, I add to Doviak's net-IVV calculus a scale for *outcomes*. The result is a mixed view which accommodates tenets (ii) and (iii) above, but allows for (i) to fail in certain cases. I argue that, rather than being a defect, this allowance is an asset because our intuitions about ought-implies-can break down in cases where an agent is grossly misguided, and our theory should track these intuitions."

<sup>56</sup> "In a well-known paper, John Doris argues that situationist psychology impugns Aristotelian virtue ethics, which presupposes the existence of stable, situation-independent virtues. Maria Merritt responds that a Humean conception of virtue, which is situation-dependent, is immune to this criticism. However, she does not directly address two of Doris' more trenchant objections, which he presents in the form of a dilemma. In this paper, I respond to Doris' dilemma, using recent research in psychology and cognitive science to show that virtue ethics, as a dispositionalist, non-codifiable theory, represents a more empirically adequate moral psychology than the leading alternatives."

<sup>57</sup> "In her book *Uneasy Virtue*, Julia Driver presents an account of motive or trait utilitarianism, one that has been taken as "the most detailed and thoroughly defended recent formulation" of consequential virtue ethics. On Driver's account character traits are morally virtuous if and only if they generally lead to good consequences for society. Various commentators have taken Driver to task over this account of virtue, which she terms "pure evaluational externalism." They object that, on Driver's account of virtue, it could turn out that traits traditionally understood as pernicious are actually virtuous. While many writers have speculated about the forms new 'virtues' might take in a hypothetical world, I will argue that at least one trait that is seemingly pernicious but would have to be counted as virtuous by Driver already exists."

<sup>58</sup> "One of the most prominent strands in contemporary work on the virtues consists in the attempt to develop a distinctive – and compelling – account of practical reason on the basis of Aristotle's ethics. In response to this project, several eminent critics have argued that the Aristotelian account encourages a dismissive attitude toward moral disagreement. Given the importance of developing a mature response to disagreement, the criticism is devastating if true. I examine this line of criticism closely, first elucidating the features of the Aristotelian account that motivate it, and then identifying two further features of the account that the criticism overlooks. These further features show the criticism to be entirely unwarranted. Once these features are acknowledged, a more promising line of criticism suggests itself – namely, that the Aristotelian account does too little to help us to resolve disputes – but that line of objection will have to be carried out on quite different grounds."

- 1995 [147] Comte-Sponville, André (1995): *Ermutigung zum unzeitgemäßen Leben. Ein kleines Brevier der Tugenden und Werte*, Reinbek bei Hamburg 1998.
- 1988 [148] Conly, Sarah (1988): Flourishing and the Failure of the Ethics of Virtue, in *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* Vol. XIII: *Ethical Theory: Character and Virtue*, hrsg. von Peter A. French, Theodore E. Uehling, Jr. und Howard K. Wettstein, Notre Dame, S. 83–96.
- 2006 [149] Coope, Christopher Miles (2006): Modern Virtue Ethics, in *Values and Virtues: Aristotelianism in Contemporary Ethics*, hrsg. von Timothy Chappell, Oxford, S. 20–52.
- 1975 [150] Cooper, John M. (1975): *Reason and Human Good in Aristotle*, Indianapolis 1986.
- 1998 [151] Cooper, John M. (1998): The Unity of Virtue, in *Virtue and Vice*, hrsg. von Ellen Frankel Paul, Fred D. Miller, Jr. und Jeffrey Paul, Cambridge, S. 233–74.
- 2010 [152] Coplan, Amy (2010): Feeling Without Thinking: Lessons from the Ancients on Emotion and Virtue-Acquisition, *Metaphilosophy* 41, S. 132–51.<sup>59</sup>
- 2011 [153] Cordell, Sean (2011): Virtuous Persons and Social Roles, *Journal of Social Philosophy* 42, S. 254–72.
- 1994 [154] Cordner, Christopher (1994): Aristotelian Virtue and its Limitations, *Philosophy* 69, 291–316.
- 1991 [155] Cottingham, John (1991): The Ethics of Self-Concern, *Ethics* 101, S. 798–817.
- 1996 [156] Cottingham, John (1996): Partiality and the Virtues, in *How Should One Live? Essays on the Virtues*, hrsg. von Roger Crisp, Oxford, S. 57–76.
- 2006 [157] Cox, Damian (2006): Agent-based Theories of Right Action, *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* 9, S. 505–15.<sup>60</sup>
- 1992 [158] Crisp, Roger (1992): Utilitarianism and the Life of Virtue, *Philosophical Quarterly* 42, S. 139–60.
- 1996 [159] Crisp, Roger (1996): Modern Moral Philosophy and the Virtues, in *How Should One Live? Essays on the Virtues*, hrsg. von Roger Crisp, Oxford, S. 1–18.
- 1998 [160] Crisp, Roger (1998): Virtue Ethics, in *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, hrsg. von Edward Craig, Vol. 9, London, S. 622–26.

---

<sup>59</sup> “By briefly sketching some important ancient accounts of the connections between psychology and moral education, I hope to illuminate the significance of the contemporary debate on the nature of emotion and to reveal its stakes. I begin the essay with a brief discussion of intellectualism in Socrates and the Stoics, and Plato’s and Posidonius’s respective attacks against it. Next, I examine the two current leading philosophical accounts of emotion: the cognitive theory and the noncognitive theory. I maintain that the noncognitive theory better explains human behavior and experience and has more empirical support than the cognitive theory. In the third section of the essay I argue that recent empirical research on emotional contagion and mirroring processes provides important new evidence for the noncognitive theory. In the final section, I draw some preliminary conclusions about moral education and the acquisition of virtue.”

<sup>60</sup> “In this paper, I develop an objection to agent-based accounts of right action. Agent-based accounts of right action attempt to derive moral judgment of actions from judgment of the inner quality of virtuous agents and virtuous agency. A moral theory ought to be something that moral agents can permissibly use in moral deliberation. I argue for a principle that captures this intuition and show that, for a broad range of other-directed virtues and motives, agent-based accounts of right action fail to satisfy this principle.”

- 2010 [161] Crisp, Roger (2010): Virtue Ethics and Virtue Epistemology, *Metaphilosophy* 41, S. 22–40.<sup>61</sup>
- 2015 [162] Crisp, Roger (2015): A Third Method of Ethics?, *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 90, S. 257–73.<sup>62</sup>
- 1996 [163] Crisp, Roger (Hrsg.) (1996): *How Should One Live? Essays on the Virtues*, Oxford.
- 1997 [164] Crisp, Roger/Slote, Michael (Hrsg.) (1997): *Virtue Ethics*, Oxford.
- 1999 [165] Cullity, Garrett (1999): Virtue Ethics, Theory, and Warrant, *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* 2, S. 277–94.
- 2023 [166] Curzer, Howard J. (2023): *Virtue Ethics for the Real World: Improving Character without Idealization*, New York.
- 1994 [167] Darwall, Stephen (1994): From Morality to Virtue and Back?, *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 54, S. 695–701. (Zu M. Slote, *From Morality to Virtue*)
- 2002 [168] Darwall, Stephen (Hrsg.) (2002): *Virtue Ethics*, Oxford.
- 2003 [169] Das, Ramon (2003): Virtue Ethics and Right Action, *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* 81, S. 324–39.<sup>63</sup>

---

<sup>61</sup> “The aim of this essay is to test the claim that epistemologists – virtue epistemologists in particular – have much to learn from virtue ethics. The essay begins with an outline of virtue ethics itself. This section concludes that a pure form of virtue ethics is likely to be unattractive, so the virtue epistemologist should examine the “impure” views of real philosophers. Aristotle is usually held up as the paradigm virtue ethicist. His doctrine of the mean is described, and it is explained how that doctrine can provide a framework for an account of epistemic virtue. The conclusion of the essay is that a virtue epistemology based on analogies with virtue ethics, though well worth developing and considering, will face several challenges in fulfilling the significant promises that have been made on its behalf.”

<sup>62</sup> “In recent decades, the idea has become common that so-called virtue ethics constitutes a third option in ethics in addition to consequentialism and deontology. This paper argues that, if we understand ethical theories as accounts of right and wrong action, this is not so. Virtue ethics turns out to be a form of deontology (that is, non-consequentialism). The paper then moves to consider the Aristotelian distinction between right or virtuous action on the one hand, and acting rightly or virtuously on the other. It is claimed that virtue might play an important role in an explanation of acting virtuously (as it does in Aristotle’s ethics), but that such explanations can be charged with ‘double-counting’ the moral value of the virtues. The paper concludes that, if we focus on the question of the value of virtue, rather than on the notion of right action, there is room for a self-standing and important view which could be described as virtue ethics.”

<sup>63</sup> “In this paper I evaluate some recent virtue-ethical accounts of right action [Hursthouse 1999; Slote 2001; Swanton 2001]. I argue that all are vulnerable to what I call the insularity objection: evaluating action requires attention to worldly consequences external to the agent, whereas virtue ethics is primarily concerned with evaluating an agent’s inner states. More specifically, I argue that insofar as these accounts are successful in meeting the insularity objection they invite the circularity objection: they end up relying upon putatively virtue-ethical considerations that themselves depend on unexplained judgments of rightness. Such accounts thus face a dilemma that is characteristic of virtue-ethical accounts of right action. They avoid the insularity objection only at the cost of inviting the circularity objection: they become intuitively plausible roughly to the extent that they lose their distinctively virtue-ethical character.”

- 1988 [170] Davis, Michael (1988): Civic Virtue, Corruption, and the Structure of Moral Theories, in *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* Vol. XIII: *Ethical Theory: Character and Virtue*, hrsg. von Peter A. French, Theodore E. Uehling, Jr. und Howard K. Wettstein, Notre Dame, S. 352–66.
- 1994 [171] DeMarco, Joseph P. (1994): *A Coherence Theory in Ethics*, Amsterdam, Atlanta, S. 54–60.
- 1996 [172] DeMarco, Joseph P. (1996): *Moral Theory. A Contemporary Overview*, Boston, S. 93–106.
- 1975 [173] Dent, N. J. H. (1975): *The Moral Psychology of the Virtues*, Cambridge.
- 1991 [174] Den Uyl, Douglas J. (1991): *The Virtue of Prudence*, New York.
- 2000 [175] DePaul, Michael (2000): Character Traits, Virtues, and Vices: Are There None?, in *Proceedings of the Twentieth World Congress of Philosophy*, Vol. 9: *Philosophy of Mind*, hrsg. von Bernard Ekvitch, Bowling Green.
- 2003 [176] DePaul, Michael/Zagzebski, Linda (Hrsg.) (2003): *Intellectual Virtue – Perspectives from Ethics and Epistemology*, Oxford.
- 2016 [177] DesAutels, Peggy (2016): Power, Virtue, and Vice, *Monist* 99, S. 128–43.<sup>64</sup>
- 2002 [178] Devettere, Raymond J. (2002): *Introduction to Virtue Ethics. Insights of the Ancient Greeks*, Washington, D. C.
- 2018 [179] Dillon, Robin S. (2018) : Feminist Approaches to Virtue Ethics, in *The Oxford Handbook of Virtue*, hrsg. von Nancy E. Snow, Oxford, S. 377–97.
- 1998 [180] Doris, John M. (1998): Persons, Situations, and Virtue Ethics, *Nous* 32, S. 504–30. – Vgl. dazu [568], [682].
- 2002 [181] Doris, John M. (2002): *Lack of Character. Personality and Moral Behavior*, Cambridge. – Vgl. dazu [25], [37], [393], [493], [564], [667], [683].
- 2005 [182] Doris, John M. (2005): Précis of *Lack of Character, Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 71, S. 632–35.
- 2005 [183] Doris, John M. (2005): Replies: Evidence and Sensibility, *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 71, S. 656–77.
- 2010 [184] Doris, John M. (2010): Heated Agreement: Lack of Character as Being for the Good, *Philosophical Studies* 148, S. 135–46. – Zu [3]. Dazu: [5].
- 2009 [185] Doviak, Daniel (2009): Virtue, Satisfaction and Welfare Enhancement, *Utilitas* 21, S. 59–71.<sup>65</sup>

---

<sup>64</sup> “I approach virtue theory in a way that avoids idealized social ontologies and instead focuses on social hierarchies that include relations of power. I focus on the virtues tied to improving social environments—what I refer to as social-ethic virtues—and examine how the development of social-ethic virtues is influenced by motivations for and situations involving power. I draw on research in social and personality psychology to show that persons motivated by power and persons holding powerful social positions tend to behave in ways that correlate with certain virtuous and vicious patterns of behavior. I maintain that patterns of moral or vicious behavior (habits) tied to those in powerful positions are upheld by a combination of motivational dispositions and situational factors and that although a strong and dominating sort of power can corrupt, an agentic power to effect social, political, and institutional change is necessary for the social-ethic virtues.”

- 2011 [186] Doviak, Daniel (2011): A New Form of Agent-Based Virtue Ethics, *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* 14, S. 1–14.<sup>66</sup> – Vgl. Dazu [141].
- 1989 [187] Driver, Julia (1989): The Virtues of Ignorance, *Journal of Philosophy* 86, S. 373–84.
- 1994 [188] Driver, Julia (1994): A Critical Study of Michael Slote's "From Morality to Virtue", *Nous* 28, S. 505–14.
- 1995 [189] Driver, Julia (1995): Monkeying with Motives: Agent-Basing Virtue Ethics, *Utilitas* 7, S. 281–85.
- 1996 [190] Driver, Julia (1996): The Virtues and Human Nature, in *How Should One Live? Essays on the Virtues*, hrsg. von Roger Crisp, Oxford, S. 111–29.
- 2001 [191] Driver, Julia (2001): *Uneasy Virtue*, Cambridge. – Vgl. dazu: [431], [545], [700].
- 2002 [192] Driver, Julia (2002): Review of *On Virtue Ethics* by Rosalind Hursthouse, *Philosophical Review* 111, S. 122–27. – Zu
- 2004 [193] Driver, Julia (2004): Response to my Critics, *Utilitas* 16, S. 33–41.<sup>67</sup> – Zu [431], [545].
- 2006 [194] Driver, Julia (2006): *Ethics. The Fundamentals*, Oxford, S. 136–53 ("Virtue Ethics").
- 2006 [195] Driver, Julia (2006): Virtue Theory, in *Contemporary Debates in Moral Theory*, hrsg. von James

---

<sup>65</sup> "In 'Is Virtue Its Own Reward?' Wayne Sumner argues that (1) as a matter of necessity, virtue is intrinsically prudentially rewarding, and (2) if all else is equal, the virtuous will fare better than the non-virtuous. In this article, I reproduce and criticize those arguments. I offer several objections to the argument for the first thesis; each objection makes the same basic point: contrary to what Sumner assumes, certain contingent facts over and above a person's being virtuous have to obtain if virtue is to issue in any prudential reward. I object to Sumner's second thesis by arguing that moral neutrality can be at least as welfare-enhancing as moral virtuosity. Finally, I argue that even if virtue were intrinsically rewarding in the way Sumner envisions, it would still be impossible to determine a priori whether adopting a virtuous lifestyle would be prudentially rational."

<sup>66</sup> "In *Morals From Motives*, Michael Slote defends an agent-based theory of right action according to which right acts are those that express virtuous motives like benevolence or care. Critics have claimed that Slote's view— and agent-based views more generally— cannot account for several basic tenets of commonsense morality. In particular, the critics maintain that agent-based theories: (i) violate the deontic axiom that "ought" implies "can", (ii) cannot allow for a person's doing the right thing for the wrong reason, and (iii) do not yield clear verdicts in a number of cases involving "conflicting motives" and "motivational over-determination". In this paper I develop a new agent-based theory of right action designed to avoid the problems presented for Slote's view. This view makes morally right action a matter of expressing an optimal balance of virtue over vice and commands agents in each situation to improve their degree of excellence to the greatest extent possible."

<sup>67</sup> "This essay is a rejoinder to comments on *Uneasy Virtue* made by Onora O'Neill, John Skorupski, and Michael Slote in this issue. In *Uneasy Virtue* I presented criticisms of traditional virtue theory. I also presented an alternative - a consequentialist account of virtue, one which is a form of 'pure evaluational externalism'. This type of theory holds that the moral quality of character traits is determined by factors external to agency (e.g. consequences). All three commentators took exception to this account. Therefore, the bulk of my response focuses on defending the externalist account of virtue presented in the final chapters of *Uneasy Virtue*."

Dreier, Oxford, S. 113–23.

- 2013 [196] Driver, Julia (2013): Virtue Ethics, in *The International Encyclopedia of Ethics*, hrsg. von Hugh LaFollette, Chichester, S. 5356–68.
- 2016 [197] Driver, Julia (2016): Minimal Virtue, *Monist* 99, S. 97–111.<sup>68</sup>
- 2025 [198] Dzwonkowska, Dominika (2025): *Virtue Ethics and the Environment*, Abingdon, New York. (Polnische Originalausgabe: 2019)
- 2015 [199] Eckert, Julia (2015): Tugendethik und Verantwortung. Eine sozialanthropologische Perspektive, in *Anthropologie und Ethik*, hrsg. von Jan-Christoph und Julian Nida-Rümelin, Berlin, S. 151–70.
- 2010 [200] Eichinger, Tobias (2010): Medizin als Praxis – zu tugendethischen Ansätzen für eine zeitgemäße Medizinethik, in *Richtlinien, Ethikstandards und kritisches Korrektiv: eine Topographie ethischen Nachdenkens im Kontext von Medizin*, hrsg. von Julia Inthorn, Göttingen, S. 142–51.
- 1993 [201] Elliot, David (1993): The Nature of Virtue and the Question of Its Primacy, *Journal of Value Inquiry* 27, S. 317–30.
- 2004 [202] Esser, Andrea Marlen (2004): *Eine Ethik für Endliche. Kants Tugendlehre in der Gegenwart*, Stuttgart-Bad Cannstatt.
- 2007 [203] Everitt, Nicholas (2007): Some Problems with Virtue Theory, *Philosophy* 82, S. 275–99.<sup>69</sup>
- 2009 [204] Eylon, Yuval (2009): Virtue and Continenence, *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* 12, S. 137–51.<sup>70</sup>

---

<sup>68</sup> “Accounts of virtue can be divided along a continuum between the robust and the minimal. The more robust an account of virtue is, the more psychological requirements it places on the possession of virtue; the most minimal account places the barest of psychological requirements on virtue. This essay presents arguments in favor of opting for a minimal account of virtue. The opening of the paper explores historical trends in the development of virtue theory that support this. The remainder of this essay discusses some of the arguments raised and suggested by historical figures in light of work on virtue by contemporary writers, and then makes a case for going even more minimal in our theory of virtue.”

<sup>69</sup> “Virtue ethics (VE for short) is currently so widely embraced that different versions of the theory can now be distinguished. Some of these are mapped out in Statman’s useful introduction to his collection. There are enough of these versions to constitute a family, and consequently what they share is a family resemblance rather than agreement to a defining set of necessary and sufficient conditions. What I propose to do, therefore, is to criticise one of the main versions of VE. Rosalind Hursthouse is the main proponent of the version which I will criticise. I choose her as a spokesperson, not because her version of VE is especially weak. On the contrary, it is because she is one of the leading protagonists of VE, and because her writings provide a lucid, powerful and elegant exposition of VE that her version of the theory is an appropriate object of scrutiny.”

<sup>70</sup> “John McDowell argued that the virtuous person (VP) knows no temptation: her perception of a situation silences all competing motivations – be it fear in the face of danger or a strong desire. The VP cannot recognize any reason to act non-virtuously as a reason, and is never inclined to act non-virtuously. This view rests on the requirement that the VP rationally respond, and not merely react, to the environment – it rests on the requirement that the relation between the VP and the world (ethical requirements) must rule out

- 2001 [205] Flanagan, Kieran/Jupp, Peter C. (2001): *Virtue Ethics and Sociology: Issues of Modernity and Religion*, Basingstoke.
- 2013 [206] Flanagan, Matthew (2013): Some Critical Reflections on Abortion and Virtue Theory, in *Virtues in Action. New Essays in Applied Virtue Ethics*, hrsg. von Michael W. Austin, Houndmills, Basingstoke, S. 102–116. – Zu [294].
- 1980 [207] Fleming, Arthur (1980): Reviewing the Virtues, *Ethics* 90, S. 587–95.
- 2006 [208] Fleming, Diana (2006): The Character of Virtue: Answering the Situationist Challenge to Virtue Ethics, *Ratio* 19, S. 24–42.<sup>71</sup>
- 1978 [209] Foot, Philippa (1978): Virtues and Vices, in dies., *Virtues and Vices and Other Essays in Moral Philosophy*, Oxford, S. 1–18. Wiederabgedruckt in *Virtue Ethics*, hrsg. von Roger Crisp und Michael Slote, Oxford 1997, S. 163–77. Tugenden und Laster, in *Tugendethik*, hrsg. von Klaus Peter Rippe und Peter Schaber, Stuttgart, S. 69–91.
- 1989 [210] Foot, Philippa (1989): Von Wright on Virtue, in *The Philosophy of Georg Henrik von Wright*, hrsg. von Paul A. Schilpp, La Salle, Ill. Wiederabgedruckt in Foot, *Moral Dilemmas and Other Topics in Moral Philosophy*, Oxford 2002, S. 105–116.
- 1994 [211] Foot, Philippa (1994): Rationality and Virtue, in *Norms, Values, and Society*, hrsg. von Herlinde Pauer-Studer, Amsterdam, S. 205–16. Wiederabgedruckt in Foot, *Moral Dilemmas and Other Topics in Moral Philosophy*, Oxford 2002, S. 159–74.

---

the possibility that the VP is a brain in a vat. I will argue that the opposite is true: virtue requires a sensitivity to temptation. The VP, as such, must be able to recognize reasons for performing non-virtuous actions as reasons, and be inclined to perform them. She must find nothing human alien. This is so because the VP must possess the ability to understand non-virtuous agents, and understanding necessarily involves vulnerability to temptation. Otherwise, it will be argued, the VP views the actions of others as determined from outside the space of reasons. But the VP, like any other person, must have the ability to view the actions of others as rational responses to the environment, not only as reactions to it. Put differently, the VP's view of others must rule out the possibility that they are brains in a vat – the possibility that their actions are merely caused, rather than justified, by the facts. Finally, it will be suggested that an amended conception of the VP can meet both requirements: view others as rationally responsive to the world, without relinquishing its relation to the facts."

<sup>71</sup> "Neo-Aristotelian virtue ethics makes essential reference to the notion of a stable, robust character-trait. It also claims to be constrained by at least a minimal degree of psychological realism. Recent developments in empirical psychology have drawn into question the evidence for the existence of such robust traits, arguing that it rests on what has been called a 'fundamental attribution error'. Virtue ethics has thus seemingly been made vulnerable to criticisms that it is essentially dependent on an erroneous, folk-psychological, notion of character and, so, must either abandon their characteristic notion of virtue or forego any pretensions to psychological realism.

I develop a two-pronged response to this objection. First, I argue that there is reason to question much of the empirical evidence and that such evidence as does exist can easily be accommodated by virtue ethics. Next, I argue that even if we allow that neo-Aristotelian virtue ethical theories does sometimes presuppose a stronger conception of character-traits than is warranted by the evidence, this does not significantly undermine the virtue ethicist's project."

- 1994 [212] Foot, Philippa (1994): Tugend und Glück, in dies., *Die Wirklichkeit des Guten. Moral-philosophische Aufsätze*, hrsg. und eingeleitet von Ursula Wolf und Anton Leist, Frankfurt a. M., S. 214–25.
- 2001 [213] Foot, Philippa (2001): *Natural Goodness*, Oxford. – *Die Natur des Guten*, Frankfurt a. M. 2004.
- 2013 [214] Frakes, Chris (2013): Environmental Degradation, Environmental Justice, and the Compassionate Agent, in *Virtues in Action. New Essays in Applied Virtue Ethics*, hrsg. von Michael W. Austin, Houndmills, Basingstoke, S. 119–31.
- 1970 [215] Frankena, William K. (1970): Prichard and the Ethics of Virtue: Notes on a Footnote, *Monist* 54, S. 1–17.
- 1973 [216] Frankena, William K. (1973): *Ethics*, Second Edition, Englewood Cliffs, N. J., S. 62–67.
- 2013 [217] Frede, Dorothea (2013): The Historic Decline of Virtue Ethics, in *Cambridge Companion to Virtue Ethics*, hrsg. von Daniel C. Russell, Cambridge, S. 124–48.
- 2014 [218] Frede, Dorothea (2014): Vom Nutzen und Nachteil der aristotelischen Tugendethik für das Leben, in *Ancient Ethics*, hrsg. von Jörg Hardy und George Rudebusch, Göttingen, S. 289–306.
- 1988 [219] French, P./Uehling, T./Wettstein, H. (Hrsg.) (1988): *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* Vol. XIII: *Ethical Theory: Character and Virtue*, South Bend, Ind.
- 2008 [220] Friedman, Marilyn (2008): Virtues and Oppression: A Complicated Relationship, *Hypatia* 23, S. 189–96.<sup>72</sup> – Zu [627].
- 2009 [221] Friedman, Marilyn (2009): Feminist Virtue Ethics, Happiness, and Moral Luck, *Hypatia* 24, S. 29–40.<sup>73</sup>
- 2013 [222] Fröding, Barbro (2013): *Virtue Ethics and Human Enhancement*, Dordrecht.<sup>74</sup>
- 1991 [223] Galston, William A. (1991): *Liberal Purposes. Goods, Virtues, and Diversity in the Liberal State*, Cambridge, S. 213–37 (“Liberal Virtues”).
- 1989 [224] Garcia, J. L. A. (1989): On ‘High-Mindedness’: Towards a Conception of Duty for Virtue-Based Moral Theories, *Proceedings of the American Catholic Philosophical Association* 63, S.

---

<sup>72</sup> “This paper raises some minor questions about Lisa Tessman’s book, *Burdened Virtues*. Friedman’s questions pertain, among other things, to the adequacy of a virtue ethical focus on character, the apparent implication of virtue ethics that oppressors suffer damaged characters and are not any better off than the oppressed, the importance of whether privileged persons may have earned their privileges, and the oppositional anger that movement feminists sometimes direct against each other.”

<sup>73</sup> “Can men who dominate women nevertheless be happy or lead flourishing lives? Building on Claudia Card’s exploration of moral luck, this paper considers the belief that male dominators cannot be happy. The discussion ranges over both virtue theory and empirical research into the “belief in a just world.” I conclude that there are reasons to avoid believing that male dominators cannot be happy or flourish, and that feminism does not need that belief.”

<sup>74</sup> Introduction. Chapter 1: The Problem. Chapter 2: The Good Life. Chapter 3: The Biological Obstacles. Chapter 4: Aristotle’s Virtues and How to Acquire Them. Chapter 5: Examples of Useful Capacities. Chapter 6: Critique of Virtue Ethics. Chapter 7: Three Enhancement Methods. Chapter 8: Conclusion.

98–107.

- 1990 [225] Garcia, J. L. A. (1990): The Primacy of the Virtuous, *Philosophia* 20, S. 69–91.
- 1997 [226] Garcia, J. L. A. (1997): Interpersonal Virtues. Whose Interests Do They Serve?, *Proceedings of the American Catholic Philosophical Association* 71, S. 31–60.
- 2015 [227] Garcia, J. L. A. (2015): Methods and Findings in the Study of Virtues: Humility, *Philosophia* 43, S. 325–35.<sup>75</sup>
- 2005 [228] Gardiner, Stephen M. (2005): Seneca’s Virtuous Moral Rules, in *Virtue Ethics, Old and New*, hrsg. von Stephen M. Gardiner, Ithaca, S. 30–59.
- 2005 [229] Gardiner, Stephen M. (Hrsg.) (2005): *Virtue Ethics, Old and New*, Ithaca.
- 2000 [230] Garrard, Eve (2000): Slote on Virtue, *Analysis* 60, S. 280–84.
- 1997 [231] Gauthier, Jeffrey A. (1997): Schiller’s Critique of Kant’s Moral Psychology: Reconciling Practical Reason and an Ethics of Virtue, *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 27, S. 513–544.
- 1977 [232] Geach, Peter (1977): *The Virtues*, Cambridge.
- 1998 [233] Gert, Bernard (1998): *Morality. Its Nature and Justification*, New York, S. 277–309 (“Virtues and Vices”).
- 1985 [234] Gewirth, Alan (1985): Rights and Virtues, *Review of Metaphysics* 38, S. 739–62.
- 2013 [235] Giebel, Heidi (2013): Extend Your Benevolence: Kindness and Generosity in the Family and Beyond, in *Virtues in Action. New Essays in Applied Virtue Ethics*, hrsg. von Michael W. Austin, Houndmills, Basingstoke, S. 70–85.
- 2005 [236] Gill, Christopher (Hrsg.) (2005): *Virtue, Norms, and Objectivity. Issues in Ancient and Modern Ethics*, Oxford.
- 2008 [237] Goldie, Peter (2008): Virtues of Art and Human Well-Being, *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society Supplementary Volume* 82, S. 179–95.<sup>76</sup>

---

<sup>75</sup> “I sketch and respond to Ryan Byerly’s distinction between a Value-Based Approach to assessing proposed accounts of a virtue—here, humility—and what he calls a Counterexample Based Approach. My first section, on method, argues that, though distinct, the two approaches are not mutually exclusive and answer different questions. Engaging his claim that the former approach is superior to the latter, I suggest that we apply Byerly’s own idea that there are different kinds of value to show, contra Byerly, each approach may be better than the other in different ways, and for different purposes. Adapting and applying a point from Aristotle and Aquinas, I suggest that Byerly’s core question—what kind of values a virtue has—may rely on a mistake, that of misunderstanding a virtue’s work of making people and things good as its possessing goodness itself. My latter section, on results, points out difficulties for Byerly’s altruistic conception of humility and defends my own view, developed in an earlier *Philosophia* article, that humility is essentially a matter of remaining unimpressed with oneself. I conclude by (apologetically) engaging and rebutting Byerly’s contention that his analysis of humility best captures a certain religious view.”

<sup>76</sup> “What is the point of art, and why does it matter to us human beings? The answer that I will give in this paper, following on from an earlier paper on the same subject, is that art matters because our being actively engaged with art, either in its production or in its appreciation, is part of what it is to live well. The focus in the paper will be on the dispositions—the virtues of art production and of art appreciation—that

- 2008 [238] Gowans, Christopher W. (2008): Virtue and Nature, *Social Philosophy and Policy* 25, S. 28–55.
- 2011 [239] Gowans, Christopher W. (2011): Virtue Ethics and Moral Relativism, in *A Companion to Relativism*, hrsg. von Steven D. Hales, Oxford, S. 391–410.
- 1999 [240] Graeser, Andreas (1999): *Philosophie und Ethik*, Düsseldorf, S. 144–49.
- 2004 [241] Graham, Gordon (2004): *Eight Theories of Ethics*, London, S. 53–70 (“Naturalism and Virtue Theory”).
- 1994 [242] Greenspan, Patricia S. (1994): Guilt and Virtue, *Journal of Philosophy* 91, S. 57–70.<sup>77</sup>
- 1996 [243] Griffin, James (1996): *Value Judgement. Improving Our Ethical Beliefs*, Oxford, S. 112–16 (“Virtue Ethics”).
- 1998 [244] Griffin, James (1998): Virtue Ethics and Environs, in *Virtue and Vice*, hrsg. von Ellen Frankel Paul, Fred D. Miller, Jr. und Jeffrey Paul, Cambridge, S. 56–70.
- 2022 [245] Haas, Jens/Vogt, Katja Maria (2022): Good and Evil in Recent Discussions - Good and Evil in Virtue Ethics, *Zeitschrift für Ethik und Moralphilosophie* 5, S. 83–88.<sup>78</sup>
- 2007 [246] Hacker-Wright, John (2007): Moral Status in Virtue Ethics, *Philosophy* 82, S. 449–73.<sup>79</sup>

---

are necessary for this kind of active engagement with art. To begin with, I will argue that these dispositions really are virtues and not mere skills. Then I will show how the virtues of art, and their exercise in artistic activity, interweave with the other kinds of virtue which are exercised in ethical and contemplative activity. And finally, I will argue that artistic activity affords, in a special way, a certain kind of emotional sharing that binds us together with other human beings.”

<sup>77</sup> “Feelings of guilt have a role to play in moral philosophy as a link between the ethics of virtue and duty. They allow for a notion of imperfect virtue as something still achievable despite serious moral lapses in the past. They also would seem to be required by perfect virtue in response to a moral dilemma. The defense of guilt in a case of dilemma has implications for virtue ethics insofar as it yields a distinction between an agent’s character and his record of moral action--and an asymmetrical justificatory treatment of guilt versus other-directed variants of emotional blame.”

(<http://romulus.umd.edu/ARHU/Depts/Philosophy/Faculty/PGreenspan/Res/g&vabs.html>)

<sup>78</sup> “Talk about evil resonates in ways that are culturally inherited. Historical and religious dimensions of “evil” often seem to be front and center. Nevertheless, we argue that it would be too quick to dismiss the study of evil within secular ethics. We defend an outlook that is inspired by ancient ethics—also called virtue ethics—which accepts the so-called Guise of the Good account of motivation. For an agent to be motivated to perform an action, something about the action must look good to her. We argue that evil actions do not constitute exceptions to the Guise of the Good. To preserve this framework, we entertain a privative account of evil, according to which evil is the absence of the good, and yet (falsely) appears in a positive light to the agent who performs an evil action. We reject the view that evil is quantitatively extreme badness. An account of evil should permit that some instances of evil are from a third person perspective not extremely bad. On this picture, evil is agent-relative; something can be evil relative to one person without being evil relative to another person. Accordingly, several qualities—rather than only one distinctive quality—can make an action evil.”

<sup>79</sup> “My contention is that virtue ethics offers an important critique of traditional philosophical conceptions of moral status as well as an alternative view of important moral issues held to depend on moral status. I argue that the scope of entities that deserve consideration depends on our conception of the demands of

- 2010 [247] Hacker-Wright, John (2010): Virtue Ethics without Right Action: Anscombe, Foot, and Contemporary Virtue Ethics, *Journal of Value Inquiry* 44, S. 209–24.
- 2015 [248] Hähnel, Martin (2015): *Das Ethos der Ethik. Zur Anthropologie der Tugend*, Wiesbaden.
- 2013 [249] Halbig, Christoph (2013): *Der Begriff der Tugend und die Grenzen der Tugendethik*, Frankfurt a. M.
- 2014 [250] Halbig, Christoph (2014): Die Einheit der Tugenden. Überlegungen zur Struktur eines Problems, in *Ancient Ethics*, hrsg. von Jörg Hardy und George Rudebusch, Göttingen, S. 403–24.
- 2020 [251] Halbig, Christoph (2020): Virtue vs. Virtue Ethics, *Zeitschrift für Ethik und Moralphilosophie* 3, S. 301–13.<sup>80</sup>
- 2018 [252] Halwani, Raja (2018): Sexual Ethics, in *The Oxford Handbook of Virtue*, hrsg. von Nancy E. Snow, Oxford, S. 680–99.
- 2005 [253] Hanafin, John/Coady, C. A. (Hrsg.) (2005): *Unity, Separateness and Conflict in the Virtues*, Aldershot.
- 2018 [254] Harden Fritz, Janie M. (2018): Communication Ethics and Virtue, in *The Oxford Handbook of Virtue*, hrsg. von Nancy E. Snow, Oxford, S. 700–21.
- 2014 [255] Hardy, Jörg (2014): Is Virtue Knowledge. Socratic Intellectualism Reconsidered, in *Ancient Ethics*, hrsg. von Jörg Hardy und George Rudebusch, Göttingen, S. 141–70.
- 1999 [256] Harman, Gilbert (1999): Moral Philosophy Meets Social Psychology. Virtue Ethics and the Fundamental Attribution Error, *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 99, S. 315–31. Wiederabgedruckt in Harman, *Explaining Value and Other Essays in Moral Philosophy*, Oxford 2000, S. 165–78. – Vgl. dazu [38], [348], [568].
- 2000 [257] Harman, Gilbert (2000): The Nonexistence of Character Traits, *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 100, S. 223–26. – Zu [38].
- 2003 [258] Harman, Gilbert (2003): No Character or Personality, *Business Ethics Quarterly* 13, S. 87–94. – Zu [562].
- 2009 [259] Harman, Gilbert (2009): Skepticism about Character Traits, *Journal of Ethics* 13, S. 235–42.<sup>81</sup>

---

virtues like justice; which entities deserve consideration emerges from a moral view of a world shaped by that conception. The deepest disputes about moral status depend on conflicting conceptions of justice. I advocate a conception of the virtue of justice that can account for the cases that pose problems for the legalistic views of moral status and discuss what ideal moral debate looks like on this view.”

<sup>80</sup> “The present article sets out to defend the thesis that among the more or less familiar enemies or challenges an adequate theory of virtue has to cope with is another, less obvious one – virtue ethics itself. The project of establishing virtue ethics as a third paradigm of normative ethics at eye level with consequentialism and deontological approaches to ethics threatens to distort not just our ethical thinking but the theory of virtue itself. A theory of virtue that is able to meet the demands of a full-blown virtue ethics necessarily has to face three fundamental dilemmas and thus seems to fail as an adequate theory of virtue. And *vice versa*: An ontologically and normatively viable theory of virtue will be unsuited to provide a promising starting point for virtue ethics as the “third kid on the block” among the options of self-standing paradigms of normative ethics.”

- 2005 [260] Harris, George W. (2005): The Virtues, Perfectionist Goods, and Pessimism, in *Virtue Ethics, Old and New*, hrsg. von Stephen M. Gardiner, Ithaca, S. 193–210.
- 2013 [261] Harris, Howard/Wijesinghe, Gayathri und McKenzie, Stephen (Hrsg.) (2013): *The Heart of the Good Institution: Virtue Ethics as a Framework for Responsible Management*, Dordrecht.
- 1995 [262] Harrison, Jonathan (1995): Is Virtue in the Interest of the Stronger? or the Prevarications of Plato, in ders., *Ethical Essays Vol. III: New Essays*, Aldershot, S. 220–44.
- 2013 [263] Hartman, Edwin (2013): The Virtue Approach to Business Ethics, in *Cambridge Companion to Virtue Ethics*, hrsg. von Daniel C. Russell, Cambridge, S. 240–64.
- 1926 [264] Hartmann, Nicolai (1926): *Ethik*, Berlin 1962, S. 416–544.
- 1999 [265] Haydon, Graham (1999): *Values, Virtues and Violence: Education and the Public Understanding of Morality*, Oxford.
- 1985 [266] Heil, John (1985): Thoughts on the Virtues, *Journal of Value Inquiry* 19, S. 27–34.
- 2008 [267] Hennig, Boris (2008): Tugenden und Absichten. Versuch, Anscombe einen Tugendbegriff zu entnehmen, *Philosophisches Jahrbuch der Görres-Gesellschaft* 115, S. 165–83.
- 2008 [268] Herdt, Jennifer A. (2008): *Putting on Virtue. The Legacy of the Splendid Vices*, Chicago.<sup>82</sup>

---

<sup>81</sup> “The first part of this article discusses recent skepticism about character traits. The second describes various forms of virtue ethics as reactions to such skepticism. The philosopher J.-P. Sartre argued in the 1940s that character traits are pretenses, a view that the sociologist E. Goffman elaborated in the 1950s. Since then social psychologists have shown that attributions of character traits tend to be inaccurate through the ignoring of situational factors. (Personality psychology has tended to concentrate on people’s conceptions of personality and character rather than on the accuracy of these conceptions). Similarly, the political theorist R. Hardin has argued for situational explanations of bloody social disputes in the former Yugoslavia and in Africa, rather than explanations in terms of ethnic hatred for example. A version of virtue ethics might identify virtues as characteristics of acts rather than character traits, as traits consisting in actual regularities in behavior, or as robust dispositions that would manifest themselves also in counterfactual situations.”

<sup>82</sup> Preface. Introduction. Part I: Splendid Vices and Imperfect Virtues. 1 Aristotle and the Puzzles of Habituation. 2 Augustine: Disordered Loves and the Problem of Pride. 3 Aquinas: Making Space for Pagan Virtue. Part II: Mimetic Virtue. 4 Erasmus: Putting On Christ. 5 The Jesuit Theatrical Tradition: Acting Virtuous. Part III: The Exodus from Virtue. 6 Luther: Saved Hypocrites. 7 Bunyan and Puritan Life-Writing: The Virtue of Self-Examination. Part IV: The Anatomy of Virtue. 8 Jesuits and Jansenists: Gracián and Pascal. 9 Emancipating Worldly Virtue: Nicole, La Rochefoucauld, and Mandeville. Part V: Pagan Virtue and Modern Moral Philosophy. 10 Rousseau and the Virtue of Authenticity. 11 Hume and the Bourgeois Rehabilitation of Pride. 12 Kant and the Pursuit of Noumenal Purity. Conclusion. Notes. Index.

“Augustine famously claimed that the virtues of pagan Rome were nothing more than splendid vices. This critique has reinvented itself as a suspicion of acquired virtue as such, and true Christian virtue has, ever since, been set against a false, hypocritical virtue alleged merely to conceal pride. *Putting On Virtue* reveals how a distrust of learned and habituated virtue shaped both early modern Christian moral reflection and secular forms of ethical thought.

- 2013 [269] Hermsberg, Kevin/Gyllenhammer, Paul (Hrsg.): *Phenomenology and Virtue Ethics*, London.<sup>83</sup>
- 2005 [270] Higgins, Kathleen Marie (2005): Negative Virtues: Zhuangzi's *Wuwei*, in *Virtue Ethics, Old and New*, hrsg. von Stephen M. Gardiner, Ithaca, S. 125–41.
- 2018 [271] Hills, Alison (2018): Moral and Aesthetic Virtue, *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 118, S. 255–74.<sup>84</sup>
- 1998 [272] Hinman, Lawrence M. (1998): *Ethics. A Pluralistic Approach to Moral Theory*, Second Edition, Fort Worth, S. 321–64 (“The Ethics of Character: Aristotle and Our Contemporaries”).
- 2019 [273] Hirji, Sukaina (2019): What's Aristotelian about neo-Aristotelian Virtue Ethics, *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 98, S. 671–96.<sup>85</sup>

---

Jennifer Herdt develops her claims through an argument of broad historical sweep, which brings together the Aristotelian tradition as taken up by Thomas Aquinas with the early modern thinkers who shaped modern liberalism. In chapters on Luther, Bunyan, the Jansenists, Mandeville, Hume, Rousseau, and Kant, she argues that efforts to guard a radical distinction between true Christian virtue and its tainted imitations ironically fostered the emergence of an autonomous natural ethics that valorized pride and authenticity, while rendering graced human agency increasingly unintelligible. Ultimately, *Putting On Virtue* traces a path from suspicion of virtue to its secular inversion, from confession of dependence to assertion of independence.” (Publisher’s description)

<sup>83</sup> *Phenomenology and Virtue Ethics: an Introduction Kevin Hermsberg*. Part I: Phenomenology and the Tradition. 1. *Phainomenon* and *Logos* in Aristotle’s Ethics Lawrence J. Hatab 2. ‘Disimpropriation’ and Infused Virtue: The Question of (Christian) Virtue Ethics in the Phenomenology of Michel Henry Michelle Rebidoux 3. Being and Virtuousness: Toward a Platonic-Heideggerian Virtue Ethics Matthew King 4. Horizon Intentionality and Aristotelian Friendship Eric Chelstrom 5. Value, Affectivity, and Virtue in Aristotle, Scheler, and von Hildebrand Gregory B. Sadle Part II: Theoretical and Contemporary Comparative Accounts 6. Phenomenology, Eudaimonia, and the Virtues John J. Drummond 7. Phenomenology and Virtue Ethics: Complementary Anti-Theoretical Methodological and Ethical Trajectories? Jack Reynolds 8. Phenomenology and the Virtues: Scheler and von Hildebrand Robert Wood 9. The Self that Recedes: A Phenomenology of Virtue J. Jeremy Wisnewski Part III: Application of Phenomenology as a Virtue Discipline 10. The Virtues of Agency: A Phenomenology of Security, Courage and Creativity John Russon 11. Heideggerian Perfectionism and the Phenomenology of the Pedagogical Truth Event Iain Thomson 12. Descent to the Things Themselves: The Virtue of Dissent John Duncan 13. Correlates of the Good Life: Body, Wilderness and Expertise Paul Gyllenhammer References Index

<sup>84</sup> “To what extent does a conception of virtue, similar to moral virtue, play a role in aesthetics? I sketch a conception of moral virtue as an orientation towards moral value and moral reasons, a set of dispositions to respond through action and both cognitive and non-cognitive attitudes. I develop a parallel conception of aesthetic virtue, as an orientation towards aesthetic value and reasons. Aesthetic virtue is fundamentally similar to moral virtue, and there are even analogies between specific virtues such as moral and aesthetic courage. I finish by discussing whether aesthetic virtue supports or conflicts with moral virtue.”

<sup>85</sup> “It is commonly assumed that Aristotle’s ethical theory shares deep structural similarities with neo-Aristotelian virtue ethics. I argue that this assumption is a mistake, and that Aristotle’s ethical theory is both importantly distinct from the theories his work has inspired, and independently compelling. I take neo-Aristotelian virtue ethics to be characterized by two central commitments: (i) virtues of character are defined as traits that reliably promote an agent’s own flourishing, and (ii) virtuous actions are defined as

- 1998 [274] Höffe, Otfried (1998): Aristoteles' universalistische Tugendethik, in *Tugendethik*, hrsg. von Klaus Peter Rippe und Peter Schaber, Stuttgart, S. 42–68.
- 2011 [275] Holland, Stephen (2011): The Virtue Ethics Approach to Bioethics, *Bioethics* 25, S. 192–201.
- 1998 [276] Holmes, Robert L. (1998): *Basic Moral Philosophy*, Belmont, CA, 2. Auflage, S. 31–61 ("The Ethics of Virtue").
- 1997 [277] Homiak, Marcia L. (1997): Aristotle on the Soul's Conflicts: Toward an Understanding of Virtue Ethics, in *Reclaiming the History of Ethics. Essays for John Rawls*, hrsg. von Andrews Reath, Barbara Herman und Christine M. Korsgaard, Cambridge, S. 7–35.
- 1998 [278] Honecker, Martin (1998): Schwierigkeiten mit dem Begriff der Tugend. Die Zweideutigkeit der Tugend, in *Tugendethik*, hrsg. von Klaus Peter Rippe und Peter Schaber, Stuttgart, S. 166–84.
- 1996 [279] Hooker, Brad (1996): Does Moral Virtue Constitute a Benefit to the Agent?, in *How Should One Live? Essays on the Virtues*, hrsg. von Roger Crisp, Oxford, S. 141–55.
- 2002 [280] Hooker, Brad (2002): The Collapse of Virtue Ethics, *Utilitas* 14, S. 22–40. – Vgl. dazu [299].
- 2008 [281] Horn, Christoph (2008): Glück und Tugend, in *Grundpositionen und Anwendungsprobleme der Ethik (Kolleg Praktische Philosophie Band 2)*, hrsg. von Volker Steenblock, Stuttgart, S. 23–54.<sup>86</sup>
- 1981 [282] Hudson, Stephen D. (1981): Taking Virtues Seriously, *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* 59, S. 189–202.
- 1986 [283] Hudson, Stephen D. (1986): *Human Character and Morality. Reflections from the History of Ideas*, Boston.
- 1980 [284] Hunt, Lester H. (1980): Courage and Principle, *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 10, S. 281–93.
- 1997 [285] Hunt, Lester H. (1997): *Character and Culture*, Lanham.
- 1992 [286] Hurka, Thomas (1992): Virtue as Loving the Good, in *The Good Life and the Human Good*, hrsg. von Ellen Frankel Paul, Fred D. Miller, Jr. und Jeffrey Paul, Cambridge, S. 149–68.
- 1997 [287] Hurka, Thomas (1997): Self-Interest, Altruism, and Virtue, *Social Philosophy and Policy* 14, S. 286–307.
- 1998 [288] Hurka, Thomas (1998): How Great a Good is Virtue?, *Journal of Philosophy* 95, S. 181ff.
- 2001 [289] Hurka, Thomas (2001): The Common Structure of Virtue and Desert, *Ethics* 112, S. 6–31.

---

the sorts of actions a virtuous agent reliably performs under the relevant circumstances. I argue that neither of these commitments are features of Aristotle's own view, and I sketch an alternative explanation for the relationship between virtue and happiness in the *Nicomachean Ethics*. Although, on the interpretation I defend, we do not find in Aristotle a distinctive normative theory alongside deontology and consequentialism, what we do find is a way of thinking about how prudential and moral reasons can come to be aligned through a certain conception of practical agency."

<sup>86</sup> „1. Begriffliche Voraussetzungen: „Glück“ und „Tugend“ im antiken und modernen Wortverständnis. 2. Das vormoderne Modell einer eudämonistischen Tugendethik. 3. Aktuelle Diskussionen über Glück und gelingendes Leben. 4. Zeitgenössische Tugendethiken. 5. Literaturhinweise.“

- 2001 [290] Hurka, Thomas (2001): *Virtue, Vice, and Value*, Oxford.
- 2001 [291] Hurka, Thomas (2001): Vices as Higher-level Evils, *Utilitas* 13, S. 195–212.
- 2006 [292] Hurka, Thomas (2006): Virtuous Act, Virtuous Dispositions, *Analysis* 66, S. 69–76.
- 2010 [293] Hurka, Thomas (2010): Right Act, Virtuous Motive, *Metaphilosophy* 41, S. 58–72.<sup>87</sup>
- 1991 [294] Hursthouse, Rosalind (1991): Virtue Theory and Abortion, *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 20, S. 223–46. Wiederabgedruckt in *Virtue Ethics*, hrsg. von Roger Crisp und Michael Slote, Oxford 1997, S. 217–38 sowie in *Virtue Ethics. A Critical Reader*, hrsg. von Daniel Statman, Edinburgh 1997, S. 227–44. – Vgl. dazu [206], [336].
- 1995 [295] Hursthouse, Rosalind (1995): Applying Virtue Ethics, in *Virtues and Reasons. Philippa Foot and Moral Theory. Essays in Honour of Philippa Foot*, hrsg. von Rosalind Hursthouse, Gavin Lawrence und Warren Quinn, Oxford, S. 57–75.
- 1996 [296] Hursthouse, Rosalind (1996): Normative Virtue Ethics, in *How Should One Live? Essays on the Virtues*, hrsg. von Roger Crisp, Oxford, S. 19–36.
- 1997 [297] Hursthouse, Rosalind (1997): Virtue Ethics and the Emotions, in *Virtue Ethics. A Critical Reader*, hrsg. von Daniel Statman, Edinburgh, S. 99–117.
- 1999 [298] Hursthouse, Rosalind (1999): *On Virtue Ethics*, Oxford. – Vgl. dazu [192], [464].
- 2002 [299] Hursthouse, Rosalind (2002): Virtue Ethics vs. Rule-Consequentialism: A Reply to Brad Hooker, *Utilitas* 14, S. 41–53. – Zu [280].
- 2003 [300] Hursthouse, Rosalind (2003): Virtue Ethics, in *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, hrsg. von Edward Zalta, <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/ethics-virtue/>.
- 2004 [301] Hursthouse, Rosalind (2004): On the Grounding of the Virtues in Human Nature, in *Was ist das für den Menschen Gute? Menschliche Natur und Güterlehre. / What Is Good for a Human Being? Human Nature and Values*, hrsg. von Jan Szaif und Matthias Lutz-Bachmann, Berlin, S. 263–75.
- 2006 [302] Hursthouse, Rosalind (2006): Are Virtues the Proper Starting Point for Morality?, in *Contemporary Debates in Moral Theory*, hrsg. von James Dreier, Oxford, S. 99–112.
- 2011 [303] Hursthouse, Rosalind (2011): What Does the Aristotelian *Phronimos* Know?, in *Perfecting Virtue. New Essays on Kantian Ethics and Virtue Ethics*, hrsg. von Lawrence Jost und Julian Wuerth, Cambridge, S. 38–57.

---

<sup>87</sup> “The concepts of virtue and right action are closely connected, in that we expect people with virtuous motives to at least often act rightly. Two well-known views explain this connection by defining one of the concepts in terms of the other. Instrumentalists about virtue identify virtuous motives as those that lead to right acts; virtue-ethicists identify right acts as those that are or would be done from virtuous motives. This essay outlines a rival explanation, based on the “higher-level” account of virtue defended in the author’s *Virtue, Vice, and Value*. On this account rightness and virtue go together because each is defined by a (different) relation to some other, more basic moral concept. Their frequent coincidence is therefore like a correlation between A and B based not on either’s causing the other but on their being joint effects of a single common cause.”

- 2012 [304] Hursthouse, Rosalind (2012): Human Nature and Aristotelian Virtue Ethics, *Royal Institute of Philosophy Supplement 70*, S. 169–188.<sup>88</sup>
- 2020 [305] Iizuka, Rie (2020): Situationism, Virtue Epistemology, and Self-Determination Theory, *Synthese* 197, S. 2309–2332.<sup>89</sup>
- 1994 [306] Irwin, T. H. (1994): Happiness, Virtue, and Morality, *Ethics* 105, S. 153–177.
- 1996 [307] Irwin, T. H. (1996): The Virtues: Theory and Common Sense in Greek Philosophy, in *How Should One Live? Essays on the Virtues*, hrsg. von Roger Crisp, Oxford, S. 37–55.
- 2005 [308] Irwin, T. H. (2005): Do Virtues Conflict? Aquinas's Answer, in *Virtue Ethics, Old and New*, hrsg. von Stephen M. Gardiner, Ithaca, S. 60–77.
- 2013 [309] Ivanhoe, Philip J. (2013): Virtue Ethics and the Chinese Confucian Tradition, in *Cambridge Companion to Virtue Ethics*, hrsg. von Daniel C. Russell, Cambridge, S. 49–69.

---

<sup>88</sup> "Given that it relies on claims about human nature, has Aristotelian virtue ethics (henceforth AVE) been undermined by evolutionary biology? There are at least four objections which are offered in support of the claim that this is so, and I argue that they all fail. The first two (Part 1) maintain that contemporary AVE relies on a concept of human nature which evolutionary biology has undercut and I show this is not so. In Part 2, I try to make it clear that Foot's Aristotelian ethical naturalism, often construed as purporting to provide virtue ethics with a foundation, is not foundationalist and is not attempting to derive ethics from biology. In Part 3, I consider the other two objections. These do not make a misguided assumption about Aristotelian ethical naturalism's foundational aspirations, nor question AVE's use of the concept of human nature, but maintain that some of AVE's empirical assumptions about human nature may well be false, given the facts of our evolution. With respect to these, I argue that, as attempts to undermine AVE specifically, they fail, though they raise significant challenges to our ethical thought quite generally."

<sup>89</sup> "Situationists [...], with reference to empirical work in psychology, have called into question the predictive and explanatory power of character traits and on this basis have criticized the empirical adequacy of moral virtue. More recently, Alfano (*Philos Q* 62(247):223–249, 2012; *Character as moral fiction*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2013) has extended the situationist critique from virtue ethics to virtue epistemology. On the line he advances, virtue responsibilism—the view that intellectual character traits play an important part in traditional and untraditional epistemological inquiries—is criticized as empirically inadequate in light of the extent to which individuals are shown to be susceptible to seemingly trivial and epistemically irrelevant situational influences. Alfano's attempted redeployment of the situationist challenge to virtue responsibilism is on closer inspection not as straightforward as he claims. It is granted that the empirical adequacy of virtue responsibilism will be eventually threatened if it can be shown that virtuous motivation is, in light of situational factors, causally ineffective. As it turns out, various psychological studies which situationists have overlooked, suggest that virtuous motivation is causally efficacious in a way that favours the position of the virtue responsibilist over the situationist. In the first part of this paper, I outline the hard core of virtue theory: both a rich motivation requirement, and a commitment to the inherent relation between virtue and a good life; then I assess whether these are undermined by situationist criticism. I address the confusion of the existing debate, and the conclusion drawn is that virtue theory ultimately remains unscathed. In the second part of my paper I defend the empirical adequacy of virtue theory based on self-determination theory. When we afford closer attention to studies on the orientation of our motivation, it becomes clear how the dynamics of our motivation have a tremendous influence on desirable behavioural outcomes: a good life."

- 1995 [310] Jacobs, Jonathan (1995): Why is Virtue Naturally Pleasing?, *Review of Metaphysics* 49, S. 21–48.
- 1995 [311] Jacobs, Jonathan (2001): *Choosing Character. Responsibility for Virtue and Vice*, Ithaca.
- 2005 [312] Jacobson, Daniel (2005): Seeing by Feeling: Virtues, Skills, and Moral Perception, *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* 8, S. 387–409.<sup>90</sup>
- 2000 [313] Jansen, Lynn A. (2000): The Virtues in Their Place: Virtue Ethics in Medicine, *Theoretical Medicine* 21, S. 261–76.
- 1998 [314] Jeffries, Vincent (1998): Virtue and the Altruistic Personality, *Sociological Perspectives* 41, S. 151–166.
- 1997 [315] Jensen, Steven J. (1997): Goods of Consequences and Goods of Virtue, *Proceedings of the American Catholic Philosophical Association* 71, S. 179–87.
- 2018 [316] Johansson, Jens/Svensson, Frans (2018): Objections to Virtue Ethics, in *The Oxford Handbook of Virtue*, hrsg. von Nancy E. Snow, Oxford, S. 491–507.
- 2003 [317] Johnson, Robert N. (2003): Virtue and Right, *Ethics* 113, S. 810–34. – Dazu: [373], [631].
- 2013 [318] Jordan, Andrew (2013): Reasons, Holism, and Virtue Theory, *Philosophical Quarterly* 63, S. 248–68.<sup>91</sup>
- 1998 [319] Kagan, Shelly (1998): *Normative Ethics*, Boulder, S. 204–12 (“Virtues”).
- 2004 [320] Kamtekar, Rachana (2004): Situationism and Virtue Ethics on the Content of Our Character, *Ethics* 114, S. 458–91.

---

<sup>90</sup> “Champions of virtue ethics frequently appeal to moral perception: the notion that virtuous people can “see” what to do. According to a traditional account of virtue, the cultivation of proper feeling through imitation and habituation issues in a sensitivity to reasons to act. Thus, we learn to see what to do by coming to feel the demands of courage, kindness, and the like. But virtue ethics also claims superiority over other theories that adopt a perceptual moral epistemology, such as intuitionism - which John McDowell criticizes for illicitly “borrow[ing] the epistemological credentials” of perception. In this paper, I suggest that the most promising way for virtue ethics to use perceptual metaphors innocuously is by adopting a skill model of virtue, on which the virtues are modeled on forms of practical know-how. Yet I contend that this model is double-edged for virtue ethics. The skill model belies some central ambitions and dogmas of the traditional view, especially its most idealized claims about virtue and the virtuous. While this may be a cost that its champions are unprepared to pay, I suggest that virtue ethics would do well to embrace a more realistic moral psychology and a correspondingly less sublime conception of virtue.”

<sup>91</sup> “Some particularists have argued that even virtue properties can exhibit a form of holism or context variance, e.g. sometimes an act is worse for being kind, say. But, on a common conception of virtuous acts, one derived from Aristotle, claims of virtue holism will be shown to be false. I argue, perhaps surprisingly, that on this conception the virtuousness of an act is not a reason to do it, and hence this conception of virtuous acts presents no challenge to particularist claims about the context variance of reasons. Still, I argue that the virtues nevertheless have important implications for our understanding of the particularism debate. Specifically, we can accept the particularist claim that reasons do not need to be principled in order to have the normative status that they do have, while still maintaining that sound moral thought and judgement has a principled structure understood in terms of the virtues.”

- 2010 [321] Kamtekar, Rachana (2010): Comments on Robert Adams, *A Theory of Virtue: Excellence in being for the Good*, *Philosophical Studies* 148, S. 147–58. – Zu [3]. Dazu: [5].
- 2013 [322] Kamtekar, Rachana (2013): Ancient Virtue Ethics: An Overview with an Emphasis on Practical Wisdom, in *Cambridge Companion to Virtue Ethics*, hrsg. von Daniel C. Russell, Cambridge, S. 29–48.
- 2002 [323] Kawall, Jason (2002): Virtue Theory and Ideal Observers, *Philosophical Studies* 109, S. 197–222.<sup>92</sup>
- 2009 [324] Kawall, Jason (2009): In Defense of the Primacy of Virtues, *Journal of Ethics and Social Philosophy* 3, Nr. 2, S. 1–21, <http://www.jesp.org/>.<sup>93</sup>
- 2009 [325] Kawall, Jason (2009): Virtue Theory, Ideal Observers, and the Supererogatory, *Philosophical Studies* 146, S. 179–96.<sup>94</sup>
- 2018 [326] Kawall, Jason (2018): Environmental Virtue Ethics, in *The Oxford Handbook of Virtue*, hrsg. von Nancy E. Snow, Oxford, S. 659–79.
- 1996 [327] Keefer, Matthew Wilks (1996): The Inseparability of Morality and Well-being: The Duty/Virtue Debate Revisited, *Journal of Moral Education* 25, S. 277–90.
- 2007 [328] Keller, Simon (2007): Virtue Ethics is Self-effacing, *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* 85, S. 221–31.<sup>95</sup> – Dazu [437].

---

<sup>92</sup> “Virtue theorists in ethics often embrace the following characterization of right action: An action is right iff a virtuous agent would perform that action in like circumstances. Zagzebski offers a parallel virtue-based account of epistemically justified belief. Such proposals are severely flawed because virtuous agents in adverse circumstances, or through lack of knowledge can perform poorly. I propose an alternative virtue-based account according to which an action is right (a belief is justified) for an agent in a given situation iff an unimpaired, fully-informed virtuous observer would deem the action to be right (the belief to be justified).”

<sup>93</sup> “In this paper I respond to a set of basic objections often raised against those virtue theories in ethics which maintain that moral properties such rightness and goodness (and their corresponding concepts) are to be explained and understood in terms of the virtues or the virtuous. The objections all rest on a strongly-held intuition that the virtues (and the virtuous) simply must be derivative in some way from either right actions or good states of affairs. My goal is to articulate several distinct, though related, objections grounded in this intuition, and to argue that virtue ethicists have ample resources to respond to these worries. The explanatory primacy of the virtuous over the right or the good emerges as a distinct and viable position.”

<sup>94</sup> “I argue that recent virtue theories (including those of Hursthouse, Slote, and Swanton) face important initial difficulties in accommodating the supererogatory. In particular, I consider several potential characterizations of the supererogatory modeled upon these familiar virtue theories (and their accounts of rightness) and argue that they fail to provide an adequate account of supererogation. In the second half of the paper I sketch an alternative virtue-based characterization of supererogation, one that is grounded in the attitudes of virtuous ideal observers, and that avoids the concerns raised in the first part of the paper.”

<sup>95</sup> “An ethical theory is self-effacing if it tells us that sometimes, we should not be motivated by the considerations that justify our acts. In his influential paper ‘The Schizophrenia of Modern Ethical Theories’ [1976], Michael Stocker argues that consequentialist and deontological ethical theories must be self-effacing, if they are to be at all plausible. Stocker’s argument is often taken to provide a reason to give up consequentialism and deontology in favour of virtue ethics. I argue that this assessment is a mistake. Virtue

- 1997 [329] Kelly, Eugene (1997): Revisiting Max Scheler's Formalism in Ethics: Virtue-Based Ethics and Moral Rules in the Non-Formal Ethics of Value, *Journal of Value Inquiry* 31, S. 381–97.
- 2002 [330] Kersting, Wolfgang (2002): *Kritik der Gleichheit. Über die Grenzen der Gerechtigkeit und der Moral*, Weilerswist, S. 217–54 („Zur Geschichte der Tugend“).
- 2000 [331] Kihlbom, Ulrik (2000): Guidance and Justification in Particularistic Ethics, *Bioethics* 14, S. 287–309.<sup>96</sup>
- 1983 [332] Kilcullen, John (1983): Utilitarianism and Virtue, *Ethics* 93, S. 451–66.
- 2023 [333] Kilov, Daniel (2023): Brittle Virtue or Bust: A New Challenge to Virtue-as-skill Theories, *Synthese* 202: 88, S. 1–16.<sup>97</sup>
- 1997 [334] Koehn, Daryl (1997): Virtue Ethics, in *The Blackwell Encyclopedic Dictionary of Business Ethics*, hrsg. von Patricia H. Werhane und R. Edward Freeman, Oxford, S. 647–50.
- 2008 [335] Koggel, Christine (2008): Burdening the Burdened Virtues, *Hypatia* 23, S. 197–204. – Zu [627].
- 2011 [336] Kornegay, R. Jo. (2011): Hursthouse's Virtue Ethics and Abortion. Abortion Ethics Without Metaphysics, *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* 14, S. 51–71<sup>98</sup>. – Zu [294].

---

ethics is self-effacing in just the same way as are the theories that Stocker attacks. Or, at the very least: if there is a way for virtue ethics to avoid self-effacement then there are ways for its rivals to avoid self-effacement too. Therefore, considerations of self-effacement provide no reason to prefer virtue ethics to its major rivals.”

<sup>96</sup> “This paper argues that, contrary to a common line of criticism followed by scholars such as Helga Kuhse, a particularistic version of virtue ethics properly elaborated, can provide sound moral guidance and a satisfactory account for moral justification of our opinions regarding, for instance, health care practice. In the first part of the paper, three criteria for comparing normative theories with respect to action-guiding power are outlined, and it is argued that the presented particularistic version of virtue ethics actually can provide more guidance than the universalistic theories favoured by Kuhse and others. In the second part of the paper it is claimed that universalist normative theories have serious problems accounting for the role that moral principles are supposed to play in the justification, of moral opinions, whereas the present version of virtue ethics accommodates a plausible alternative idea of justification without invoking moral principles or eschewing objectivity.”

<sup>97</sup> “Buoyed by research in philosophy and moral psychology, virtue ethics has become increasingly influential in the literature. This renewed attention has also led to the development of the *situationist challenge*: empirical studies undermine the idea that we possess character traits that allow us to act virtuously across contexts. A promising reply to the situationist challenge is that we should not conceive of virtues as traits. Instead, we should conceive of them as expert skills. Here, I raise a new challenge for those who go in for the (s)kill against situationism. Expert skills are *brittle*, rather than flexible or robust. They typically develop in narrow ways and can falter in novel situations. Experts also sometimes perform worse than novices in novel situations. Such findings present a problem for the virtue-as-skill thesis. Someone who will help others only in narrow contexts or who causes more harm than good does not exemplify virtue. The brittleness of expert skills means that virtue theorists must either (a) abandon the idea that virtues explain behaviour across contexts or (b) abandon the idea that virtues are expert skills. It's *brittle* virtue or bust – you can't teach an old dogma new skills.”

- 2000 [337] Kristjánsson, Kristján (2000): Virtue Ethics and Emotional Conflict, *American Philosophical Quarterly* 37, S. 193–207.
- 2008 [338] Kristjánsson, Kristján (2008): An Aristotelian Critique of Situationism, *Philosophy* 83, S. 55–76.<sup>99</sup>
- 2018 [339] Kristjánsson, Kristján (2018): Virtue from the Perspective of Psychology, in *The Oxford Handbook of Virtue*, hrsg. von Nancy E. Snow, Oxford, S. 546–68.
- 2024 [340] Kristjánsson, Kristján (2024): Considerateness Differentiated: Three Types of Virtuousness, *Journal of the American Philosophical Association* 10, S. 780–96.<sup>100</sup>
- 1987 [341] Kruschwitz, R./Roberts R. (Hrsg.) (1987): *The Virtues. Contemporary Essays on Moral Character*, Belmont, Cal.
- 1998 [342] Kultgen, John (1998): The Vicissitudes of Common-Sense Virtue Ethics, Part I: From Aristotle to Slote, *Journal of Value Inquiry* 32, S. 325–41.

---

<sup>98</sup> “This essay explicates and evaluates the roles that fetal metaphysics and moral status play in Rosalind Hursthouse’s abortion ethics. It is motivated by Hursthouse’s puzzling claim in her widely anthologized paper “Virtue Ethics and Abortion” that fetal moral status and (by implication) its underlying metaphysics are “in a way, fundamentally irrelevant” to her position. The essay clarifies the roles that fetal ontology and moral status do in fact play in her abortion ethics. To this end, it presents and then develops her fetal metaphysics of the potential and actual human being, which she merely adumbrates in her more extensive treatment of abortion ethics in her book *Beginning Lives*. The essay then evaluates her fetal ontology in light of relevant research on fetal neural and psychological development. It concludes that her implied view that the late-stage fetus is an actual human being is defensible. The essay then turns to the analysis of late-stage abortions in her paper and argues that it is importantly incomplete.”

<sup>99</sup> “Aristotle says that no human achievement has the stability of activities that express virtue. Ethical situationists consider this claim to be refutable by empirical evidence. If that is true, not only Aristotelianism, but folk psychology, contemporary virtue ethics and character education have all been seriously infirmed. The aim of this paper is threefold: (1) to offer a systematic classification of the existing objections against situationism under four main headings: ‘the methodological objection’, ‘the moral dilemma objection’, ‘the bullet-biting objection’ and ‘the anti-behaviouristic objection’; (2) to resuscitate a more powerful Aristotelian version of the ‘anti-behaviouristic objection’ than advanced by previous critics; and (3) to explore some of the implications of such resuscitation for our understanding of the salience of character and for future studies of its nature.”

<sup>100</sup> “Despite the prevalence of the virtue of considerateness in everyday moral discourse and the proliferation of philosophical studies of virtue language, considerateness hardly ever appears on philosophical agendas. When discussed in academia, its meaning seems fuzzy and unclear. This article makes amends for this gap by subjecting considerateness to conceptual scrutiny. The author argues that considerateness designates a cluster concept, encompassing three types of virtuousness that share a family resemblance only. One is a hybrid civic-moral social-glue virtue, extensionally equivalent to Aristotle’s virtue of agreeableness. The second is an intellectual virtue of *phronetic* consideration (moral sensitivity and integration). The third is a full-fledged discrete moral virtue with standard Aristotelian features of a golden-mean structure and an emotional component as a motivator. The advantages of identifying these three types of virtuousness are elicited, as are some of the educational ramifications of analyzing the *differentia* of considerateness in this way.”

- 1998 [343] Kultgen, John (1998): The Vicissitudes of Common-Sense Virtue Ethics, Part II: The Heuristic Use of Common Sense, *Journal of Value Inquiry* 32, S. 465–78.
- 1999 [344] Kupfer, Joseph (1999): *Visions of Virtue in Popular Film*, Boulder.<sup>101</sup>
- 2007 [345] Kupfer, Joseph H. (2007): *Prostitutes, Musicians, and Self-Respect: Virtues and Vices of Personal Life*, Lanham.<sup>102</sup>
- 1988 [346] Kupperman, Joel J. (1988): Character and Ethical Theory, in *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* Vol. XIII: *Ethical Theory: Character and Virtue*, hrsg. von Peter A. French, Theodore E. Uehling, Jr. und Howard K. Wettstein, Notre Dame, S. 115–25.
- 1991 [347] Kupperman, Joel J. (1991): *Character*, New York, S. 90–114 (“Justice and the Virtues”).
- 2001 [348] Kupperman, Joel J. (2001): The Indispensability of Character, *Philosophy* 76, S. 239–50. – Zu [256].
- 2006 [349] Kupperman, Joel J. (2006): *Six Myths About the Good Life: Thinking About What Has Value*, Indianapolis, S. 82–109 (“Myth Five – There Is No Real Connection, At Least in This Life, Between True Virtue and a Desirable Kind of Life”), S. 110–27 (“Myth Six – True Virtue Is Impeccable”).
- 2007 [350] Kupperman, Joel J. (2007): *Ethics and Qualities of Life*, Oxford, S. 183–90 (“Appendix: Virtue Ethics”).
- 2009 [351] Kupperman, Joel J. (2009): Virtue in Virtue Ethics, *Journal of Ethics* 13, S. 243–55.<sup>103</sup>
- 1946 [352] Laird, J. (1946): Act-Ethics and Agent-Ethics, *Mind* 55, S. 113–32.
- 2008 [353] Lara, Amy (2008): Virtue Theory and Moral Facts, *Journal of Value Inquiry* 42, S. 331–52.
- 2009 [354] LeBar, Mark (2009): Virtue Ethics and Deontic Constraints, *Ethics* 119, S. 642–71.
- 2013 [355] LeBar, Mark (2013): Virtue and Politics, in *Cambridge Companion to Virtue Ethics*, hrsg. von Daniel C. Russell, Cambridge, S. 265–89.
- 2018 [356] LeBar, Mark (2018): Eudaimonism, in *The Oxford Handbook of Virtue*, hrsg. von Nancy E. Snow,

---

<sup>101</sup> “Synopsis: Out of the interplay between film criticism and a philosophical view of virtue, Joseph Kupfer argues that film fictions can be integral to moral reflection, and thus by examining the narrative and cinematic aspects of popular films, we can derive important moral truths about people and their behaviour. Taking as his base a classical conception of virtue and vice, Kupfer offers an in-depth examination of “Groundhog Day”, “The African Queen”, “Parenthood”, “Rob Roy”, “Fresh”, “Jaws” and “Aliens” in order to investigate the value of virtue within ever-widening social contexts.” (Amazon.co.uk)

<sup>102</sup> “Introduction. Chapter 1. The Moral Perspective of Humility. Chapter 2. Sentimentalizing Emotion. Chapter 3. Generosity of Spirit. Chapter 4. Overcoming Envy. Chapter 5. When Waiting is Weightless: The Virtue of Patience. Chapter 6. No Regrets, No Debts: The Virtue of Gratitude. Chapter 7. Romantic Love and Moral Growth. Chapter 8. Prostitutes, Musicians, and Self-Respect. Conclusion.”

<sup>103</sup> “This paper represents two polemics. One is against suggestions (made by Harman and others) that recent psychological research counts against any claim that there is such a thing as genuine virtue (Cf. Harman, in: Byrne, Stalnaker, Wedgwood (eds.) *Fact and value*, pp 117–127, 2001). The other is against the view that virtue ethics should be seen as competing against such theories as Kantian ethics or consequentialism, particularly in the specification of decision procedures.”

Oxford, S. 470–87.

- 1994 [357] Lemos, John (1994): The Unity of the Virtues and Its Recent Defenses, *Southern Journal of Philosophy* 32, S. 85–106.
- 2007 [358] Lemos, John (2007): Foot and Aristotle on Virtues and Flourishing, *Philosophia* 37, S. 43–62.<sup>104</sup>
- 2023 [359] Lenzi, Dominic (2023): How Should We Respond to Climate Change. Virtue Ethics and Aggregation Problems, *Journal of Social Philosophy* 54, S. 421–36.
- 1997 [360] Little, Margaret O. (1997): Virtue as Knowledge: Objections from the Philosophy of Mind, *Nous* 31, S. 59–79.
- 2024 [361] Little, Sabrina (2024): Variations in Virtue Phenomenology, *Journal of Value Inquiry* 58, S. 681–700. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10790-022-09920-7>.<sup>105</sup>
- 1993 [362] Littlejohn, Ronnie L. (1993): *Ethics. Studying the Art of Moral Appraisal*, Lanham, S. 115–27 (“Responsibility Descriptions Using Virtue and Vice Concepts”).
- 1999 [363] Liszka, James Jakób (1999): *Moral Competence. An Integrated Approach to the Study of Ethics*, Upper Saddle River, NJ., S. 114–94 (“Virtue and Vice”).
- 2012 [364] Lott, Micah (2012): Have Elephant Seals Refuted Aristotle? Nature, Function, and Moral Goodness, *Journal of Moral Philosophy* 9, S. 353–75.<sup>106</sup>
- 2012 [365] Lott, Micah (2012): Moral Virtue as Knowledge of Human Form, *Social Theory and Practice* 38, S. 407–31.<sup>107</sup>

---

<sup>104</sup> “This article compares the views of Foot and Aristotle on virtues and flourishing. It is argued that the view put forward in Philippa Foot’s recent book, *Natural Goodness*, suffers from a certain sort of vagueness and it is open to other criticisms which the Aristotelian view can avoid. Foot’s views have been subjected to criticism in the recent literature by David Copp and David Sobel. These criticisms are given consideration in the article and it is argued that the more traditional Aristotelian view advocated by the author will have the means to answer some of these criticisms whereas Foot’s view will not.”

<sup>105</sup> “The virtue development literature often draws on the language of goal-directed automaticity and flow states in discussions of virtue. This article examines the attentional features of various virtues and argues that only some virtuous actions can be adequately described in these terms. It proposes a distinction between three kinds of virtuous actions—flow state actions, deliberative actions, and presence actions—which have varying attentional features, bodily reliance, and conscious reasoning in virtue performance. Then the article motivates these distinctions as important, describing how one might take on-board these classifications in character education, providing a more tailored development of virtues.”

<sup>106</sup> “An influential strand of neo-Aristotelianism, represented by writers such as Philippa Foot, holds that moral virtue is a form of natural goodness in human beings, analogous to deep roots in oak trees or keen vision in hawks. Critics, however, have argued that such a view cannot get off the ground, because the neo-Aristotelian account of natural normativity is untenable in light of a Darwinian account of living things. This criticism has been developed most fully by William Fitzpatrick in his book *Teleology and the Norms of Nature*. In this paper, I defend the neo-Aristotelian account of natural normativity, focusing on Fitzpatrick’s arguments. I argue that a natural goodness view is not impugned by an evolutionary account. Nor can neo-Aristotelian life form judgments be replaced by an evolutionary view of living things.”

- 1984 [366] Louden, Robert B. (1984): On Some Vices of Virtue Ethics, *American Philosophical Quarterly* 21, S. 227–36. Wiederabgedruckt in *Virtue Ethics*, hrsg. von Roger Crisp und Michael Slote, Oxford 1997, S. 201–16 sowie in *Virtue Ethics. A Critical Reader*, hrsg. von Daniel Statman, Edinburgh 1997, S. 180–93. – Einige Laster Tugendethik, in *Tugendethik*, hrsg. von Klaus Peter Rippe und Peter Schaber, Stuttgart, S. 185–212.
- 1986 [367] Louden, Robert B. (1986): Kant's Virtue Ethics, *Philosophy* 61, S. 473–89. Wiederabgedruckt in *Virtue Ethics. A Critical Reader*, hrsg. von Daniel Statman, Edinburgh 1997, S. 286–99.
- 1990 [368] Louden, Robert B. (1990): Virtue Ethics and Anti-Theory, *Philosophia* 20, S. 93–114.
- 2005 [369] Lovibond, Sabina (2005): Virtue, Nature, and Providence, in *Virtue, Norms, and Objectivity. Issues in Ancient and Modern Ethics*, hrsg. von Christopher Gill, Oxford, S. 99–112.
- 2011 [370] Lu, Mathew (2011): Abortion and Virtue Ethics, in *Persons, Moral Worth, and Embryos. A Critical Analysis of Pro-Choice Arguments*, hrsg. von Stephen Napier, Dordrecht, S. 101–23.
- 2002 [371] Luckner, Andreas (2002): Handlungen und Haltungen. Zur Renaissance der Tugendethik, *Deutsche Zeitschrift für Philosophie* 50, S. 779–96.
- 2007 [372] McAleer, Sean (2007): An Aristotelian Account of Virtue Ethics: An Essay in Moral Taxonomy, *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* 88, S. 208–25.<sup>108</sup>
- 2010 [373] McAleer, Sean (2010): Four Solutions to the Alleged Incompleteness of Virtue Ethics, *Journal of Ethics and Social Philosophy* 4 (3), S. 1–20. <http://jesp.org/articles/view.php?id=47>. – Zu [317].
- 1979 [374] McDowell, John (1979): Virtue and Reason, *Monist* 62, S. 331–50. Wiederabgedruckt in McDowell, *Mind, Value, and Reality*, Cambridge, Mass. 1998, S. 50–73.
- 1990 [375] Macedo, Stephen (1990): *Liberal Virtues*, Oxford.
- 1992 [376] Macedo, Stephen (1992): Charting Liberal Virtues, in *Virtue (Nomos 34)*, hrsg. von John W. Chapman und William A. Galston, New York, S. 204–32.
- 1998 [377] Machan, Tibor R. (1998): *Generosity: Virtue in the Civil Society*, Washington.<sup>109</sup>

---

<sup>107</sup> "This essay defends Aristotelian naturalism against the objection that it is naïvely optimistic, and contrary to empirical research, to suppose that virtues like justice are naturally good while vices like injustice are naturally defective. This objection depends upon the mistaken belief that our knowledge of human goodness in action and choice must come from the natural sciences. In fact, our knowledge of goodness in human action and character depends upon a practical understanding that is possessed by someone not qua scientist but qua practically wise person. I spell out some key features of this knowledge of human form, including its relation to practical reasons and its similarity to the "know-how" of crafts-persons. My account of virtue as knowledge of human form sheds light on the Aristotelian thesis that humans live according to an understanding of their own form. My account also clarifies the kinship and the divergence between Aristotelian and Kantian ethics."

<sup>108</sup> "I argue that a virtue ethics takes virtue to be more basic than rightness and at least as basic as goodness. My account is Aristotelian because it avoids the excessive inclusivity of Martha Nussbaum's account and the deficient inclusivity of Gary Watson's account. I defend the account against the objection that Aristotle does not have a virtue ethics by its lights, and conclude with some remarks on moral taxonomy."

- 1977 [378] Mackie, John Leslie (1977): *Ethics. Inventing Right and Wrong*, Harmondsworth, S. 186–89 (“Virtue”). – *Ethik. Die Erfindung des moralisch Richtigen und Falschen*, durchgesehene und verbesserte Ausgabe, Stuttgart 1983, S. 237–42 („Tugend“).
- 1981 [379] MacIntyre, Alasdair (1981): *After Virtue. A Study in Moral Theory*, Notre Dame (2<sup>nd</sup> edition: Notre Dame 1984). – *Der Verlust der Tugend. Zur moralischen Krise der Gegenwart*, Frankfurt a. M. 1987.
- 1988 [380] MacIntyre, Alasdair (1988): *Sōphrosunē: How a Virtue Can Become Socially Disruptive*, in *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* Vol. XIII: *Ethical Theory: Character and Virtue*, hrsg. von Peter A. French, Theodore E. Uehling, Jr. und Howard K. Wettstein, Notre Dame, S. 1–11.
- 1992 [381] MacIntyre, Alasdair (1992): *Virtue Ethics*, in *Encyclopedia of Ethics*, hrsg. von Lawrence C. Becker und Charlotte B. Becker, New York, London, Vol. II, S. 1276–82.
- 1999 [382] MacIntyre, Alasdair (1999): *Dependent Rational Animals. Why Human Beings Need the Virtues*, Chicago.
- 1999 [383] McKinnon, Christine (1999): *Character, Virtue Theories, and the Vices*, Peterborough.
- 2020 [384] McPherson, David (2020): *Virtue and Meaning. A Neo-Aristotelian Perspective*, Cambridge.<sup>110</sup>
- 2012 [385] Marcum, James A. (2012): *The Virtuous Physician. The Role of Virtue in Medicine*, Dordrecht.
- 2011 [386] Martinez, Joel (2011): *Is Virtue Ethics Self-Effacing?*, *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* 89, S. 277–88.<sup>111</sup>

---

<sup>109</sup> The author, [Macchan@Chapman.edu](mailto:Macchan@Chapman.edu), 1 October, 1997: “The virtue of generosity is a spontaneous, though rationally cultivated, disposition of persons to extend their help to others who can use and deserve it. As with other virtues, generosity presupposes that persons can make free choices as to how they will act. Its full flourishing in a community requires, furthermore, that the rights to liberty of action are fully respected and protected. Contending, as some do, that generous conduct may be elicited by coercive measures or prohibitions laid down against trade – e.g., so as to encourage blood donations – is wrongheaded. Coerced “generosity” is not virtuous and removing the option to trade also does violence to the conditions required for virtuous generosity. In their eagerness to provide for the needy, some thinkers make public policy proposals that destroy the human capacity for virtuous generosity. Only if men and women are left free – that is, if they live in civil society – can they be expected to act as they should, including generously, when that is appropriate.” (Amazon.co.uk)

<sup>110</sup> “The revival of Aristotelian virtue ethics can be seen as a response to the modern problem of disenchantment, that is, the perceived loss of meaning in modernity. However, in *Virtue and Meaning*, David McPherson contends that the dominant approach still embraces an overly disenchanting view. In a wide-ranging discussion, McPherson argues for a more fully re-enchanting perspective that gives better recognition to the meanings by which we live and after which we seek, and to the fact that human beings are the meaning-seeking animal. In doing so, he defends distinctive accounts of the relationship between virtue and happiness, other-regarding demands, and the significance of linking neo-Aristotelian virtue ethics with a view of the meaning of life and a spiritual life where contemplation has a central role. This book will be valuable for philosophers and other readers who are interested in virtue ethics and the perennial question of the meaning of life.”

- 1996 [387] Mason, Andrew (1996): MacIntyre on Modernity and How It Has Marginalized the Virtues, in *How Should One Live? Essays on the Virtues*, hrsg. von Roger Crisp, Oxford, S. 191–209.
- 2002 [388] Mayer, Verena (2002): Tugend und Gefühl, in *Die Moralität der Gefühle*, hrsg. von Sabine A. Döring und Verena Mayer, Berlin, S. 125–50.
- 2009 [389] Mayer, Verena (2009): Tugend aus negativer Freiheit. Eine universelle Begründungsstruktur für moralische Normen, in *Moralischer Relativismus*, hrsg. von Gerhard Ernst, Paderborn, S. 213–29.
- 1984 [390] Meilaender, Gilbert (1984): *The Theory and Practice of Virtue*, Notre Dame, Ind.
- 2000 [391] Merritt, Maria (2000): Virtue Ethics and Situationist Personality Psychology, *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* 3, S. 365–83.
- 2009 [392] Merritt, Maria W. (2009): Aristotelean Virtue and the Interpersonal Aspect of Ethical Character, *Journal of Moral Philosophy* 6, S. 23–49.<sup>112</sup>

---

<sup>111</sup> “Virtue ethicists argue that modern ethical theories aim to give direct guidance about particular situations at the cost of offering artificial or narrow accounts of ethics. In contrast, virtue ethical theories guide action indirectly by helping one understand the virtues – but the theory will not provide answers as to what to do in particular instances. Recently, this had led many to think that virtue ethical theories are self-effacing the way some claim consequentialist and deontological theories are. In this paper I defend virtue ethics against the charge of self-effacement. I distinguish between modestly self-effacing theories, immodestly self-effacing theories and theories that recommend indirect guidance. Though all self-effacing theories are indirect, not all indirect theories are self-effacing. I argue that virtue ethics is not self-effacing, but rather indirectly action-guiding. The response I articulate draws on the distinctive virtue ethical mode of action-guidance: namely, that thinking hard about virtue and what kind of person one aims to be offers the kind of guidance we want (or should want) as we face practical moral problems.”

<sup>112</sup> “I examine the Aristotelean conception of virtuous character as firm and unchangeable, a normative ideal endorsed in the currently influential, broadly Aristotelean school of thought known as ‘virtue ethics’. Drawing on central concepts of Aristotle’s *Nicomachean Ethics*, I offer an account of how this ideal is supposed to be realized psychologically. I then consider present-day empirical findings about relevant psychological processes, with special attention to interpersonal processes. The empirical evidence suggests that over time, the same interpersonal processes that sometimes help to sustain character may also disrupt it, even among agents who have the right values in principle. Fortunately, the evidence also suggests some remedial measures. An important philosophical measure, I conclude, is for advocates of virtue ethics to address agents’ psychological need for a systematic decision procedure that will focus attention primarily on substantive ethical considerations, rather than characterological assessment.”

- 2003 [393] Miller, Christian B. (2003): Social Psychology and Virtue Ethics, *Journal of Ethics* 7, S. 365–92.<sup>113</sup>
- 2009 [394] Miller, Christian B. (2009): Empathy, Social Psychology, and Global Helping Traits, *Philosophical Studies* 142, S. 247–75.<sup>114</sup>
- 2009 [395] Miller, Christian (2009): Social Psychology, Mood, and Helping: Mixed Results for Virtue Ethics, *Journal of Ethics* 13, S. 145–73.<sup>115</sup>
- 2018 [396] Miller, Christian (2018): *The Character Gap: How Good Are We?* Oxford.<sup>116</sup>
- 2018 [397] Miller, Christian B. (2018): Virtue as a Trait, in *The Oxford Handbook of Virtue*, hrsg. von Nancy E. Snow, Oxford, S. 9–34.
- 2005 [398] Millgram, Elijah (2005): Reasonably Virtuous, in Millgram, *Ethics Done Right. Practical Reasoning as a Foundation for Moral Theory*, Cambridge, S. 133–67.

---

<sup>113</sup> “Several philosophers have recently claimed to have discovered a new and rather significant problem with virtue ethics. According to them, virtue ethics generates certain expectations about the behavior of human beings which are subject to empirical testing. But when the relevant experimental work is done in social psychology, the results fall remarkably short of meeting those expectations. So, these philosophers think, despite its recent success, virtue ethics has far less to offer to contemporary ethical theory than might have been initially thought. I argue that there are plausible ways in which virtue ethicists can resist arguments based on empirical work in social psychology. In the first three sections of the paper, I reconstruct the line of reasoning being used against virtue ethics by looking at the recent work of Gilbert Harman and John Doris. The remainder of the paper is then devoted both to responding to their challenge as well as to briefly sketching a positive account of character trait possession.”

<sup>114</sup> “The central virtue at issue in recent philosophical discussions of the empirical adequacy of virtue ethics has been the virtue of compassion. Opponents of virtue ethics such as Gilbert Harman and John Doris argue that experimental results from social psychology concerning helping behavior are best explained not by appealing to so-called ‘global’ character traits like compassion, but rather by appealing to external situational forces or, at best, to highly individualized ‘local’ character traits. In response, a number of philosophers have argued that virtue ethics can accommodate the empirical results in question. My own view is that neither side of this debate is looking in the right direction. For there is an impressive array of evidence from the social psychology literature which suggests that many people do possess one or more robust global character traits pertaining to helping others in need. But at the same time, such traits are noticeably different from a traditional virtue like compassion.”

<sup>115</sup> “I first summarize the central issues in the debate about the empirical adequacy of virtue ethics, and then examine the role that social psychologists claim positive and negative mood have in influencing compassionate helping behavior. I argue that this psychological research is compatible with the claim that many people might instantiate certain character traits after all which allow them to help others in a wide variety of circumstances. Unfortunately for the virtue ethicist, however, it turns out that these helping traits fall well short of exhibiting certain central features of compassion.”

<sup>116</sup> Acknowledgements. Preface. Part 1: What is Character and Why is it Important? 1. What Are We Talking About? 2. Why Should We Bother Developing a Good Character? Part 2: What Does Our Character Actually Look Like Today? 3. Helping. 4. Harming. 5. Lying. 6. Cheating. 7. Putting the Pieces about Character Together. Part Three: What Can We Do to Improve Our Characters? 8. Some Initial and Less Promising Strategies. 9. Some Strategies with More Promise for Improving Our Characters. 10. Improving Our Characters with Divine Assistance. Works Cited.

- 1998 [399] Milo, Ronald D. (1998): Virtue, Knowledge, and Wickedness, in *Virtue and Vice*, hrsg. von Ellen Frankel Paul, Fred D. Miller, Jr. und Jeffrey Paul, Cambridge, S. 196–232.
- 1992 [400] Montague, Phillip (1992): Virtue Ethics: A Qualified Success Story, *American Philosophical Quarterly* 29. Wiederabgedruckt in *Virtue Ethics. A Critical Reader*, hrsg. von Daniel Statman, Edinburgh 1997, S. 194–204.
- 1998 [401] Montmarquet, James A. (1998): An Asymmetry Concerning Virtue and Vice, *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 28, S. 149–59.
- 2008 [402] Montmarquet, James A. (2008): The Voluntariness of Virtue – and Belief, *Philosophy* 83, S. 373–90.<sup>117</sup>
- 2017 [403] Moore, Geoff (2017): *Virtue at Work. Ethics for Individuals, Managers, and Organizations*, Oxford.<sup>118</sup>
- 1990 [404] Moravcsik, Julius M. (1990): The Role of Virtue in Alternatives to Kantian and Utilitarian Ethics, *Philosophia* 20, S. 33–48.
- 1998 [405] Müller, Anselm Winfried (1998): *Was taugt die Tugend? Elemente einer Ethik des guten Lebens*. Mit einem Gespräch mit August Everding, Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.
- 2015 [406] Murray, Dylan (2015): Situationism, Going Mental, and modal *akrasia*, *Philosophical Studies* 172, S. 711–36.<sup>119</sup>

---

<sup>117</sup> “This paper examines the relative voluntariness of three types of virtue: ‘epistemic’ virtues like open-mindedness; ‘motivational’ virtues like courage, and more robustly ‘moral’ virtues like justice. A somewhat novel conception of the voluntariness of belief is offered in terms of the limited, but quite real, voluntariness of certain epistemic virtues.”

<sup>118</sup> List of Figures. 1. Introduction. PART I. ORGANIZATIONS AND VIRTUE ETHICS. 2. Organizations and Ethics. 3. Virtue Ethics and Organizational Ethics. 4. A MacIntyrean Approach to Organizations and Organizational Ethics. PART II. IMPLICATIONS FOR INDIVIDUALS, MANAGERS, AND ORGANIZATIONS. 5. Implications for Individuals. 6. Implications for Managers. 7. Implications for Organizations. PART III. ORGANIZATIONAL VIRTUE ETHICS IN PRACTICE. 8. Virtue Ethics in Business Organizations. 9. Virtue Ethics in Non-Business Organizations. Conclusions. References. Index.

<sup>119</sup> “Virtue ethics prescribes cultivating global and behaviorally efficacious character traits, but John Doris (*Nous* 32:504–530, 1998; *Lack of character: personality and moral behavior*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2002) and others argue that situationist social psychology shows this to be infeasible. Here, I show how certain versions of virtue ethics that ‘go mental’ can withstand this challenge as well as Doris’ (*Philos Stud* 148:135–146, 2010) further objections. The defense turns on an account of which psychological materials constitute character traits and which the situationist research shows to be problematically variable. Many situationist results may be driven by impulsive *akrasia* produced by low-level (in some cases even perceptual), emotionally induced ignorance about one’s situation, and some may be driven by a further subtype: modal *akrasia*. Many subjects in the infamous Milgram experiments, e.g., seem to have recognized what the virtuous thing to do was and that they should do it, and only failed to do it because their emotions prevented them from seeing (or at least from recognizing, at the level of deliberation) that they could. If the primary constituents of character traits are higher-level mental dispositions involved in deliberation, though, then the results don’t show that these psychological materials are problematically variable.”

- 2015 [407] Narvaez, Darcia (2015): The Co-Construction of Virtue. Epigenetics, Development, and Culture, in *Cultivating Virtue. Perspectives from Philosophy, Theology, and Psychology*, hrsg. von Nancy E. Snow, Oxford, S. 251–77.
- 2016 [408] Nassery, Idris/Schmidt, Jochen (Hrsg.) (2016): *Moralische Vortrefflichkeit in der pluralen Gesellschaft. Tugendethik aus philosophischer, christlicher und muslimischer Perspektive*, Paderborn.
- 1996 [409] Nida-Rümelin, Julian (1996): Theoretische und Angewandte Ethik: Paradigmen, Begründungen, Bereiche, in *Angewandte Ethik. Die Bereichsethiken und ihre theoretische Fundierung. Ein Handbuch*, hrsg. von Julian Nida-Rümelin, Stuttgart, S. 2–85: S. 31–37 („Das tugendethische Paradigma (Tugendethik)“).
- 1984 [410] Nielsen, Kai (1984): Critique of Pure Virtue. Animadversions on a Virtue-Based Ethic, in *Virtue and Medicine*, hrsg. von E. E. Shelp, Dordrecht, S. 133–49. Wiederabgedruckt in Nielsen, *Why Be Moral?*, Buffalo, New York 1989, S. 228–44. [Zu MacIntyre, *After Virtue*]
- 1998 [411] Norman, Richard (1998): *The Moral Philosophers. An Introduction to Ethics*, 2. Aufl., Oxford, S. 197–200 („Virtue Ethics“).
- 1991 [412] Norton, David L. (1991): *Democracy and Moral Development: A Politics of Virtue*, Berkeley.
- 1993 [413] Nussbaum, Martha (1993): Non-Relative Virtues: An Aristotelian Approach, in *The Quality of Life*, hrsg. von Martha C. Nussbaum und Amartya Sen, Oxford, S. 242–70. – Nicht-relative Tugenden: Ein aristotelischer Ansatz, in *Tugendethik*, hrsg. von Klaus Peter Rippe und Peter Schaber, Stuttgart 1998, S. 114–65. – Vgl. dazu: Hurley, Susan L. (1993): Commentary on Martha Nussbaum, „Non-Relative Virtues: An Aristotelian Approach“, in *The Quality of Life*, hrsg. von Martha C. Nussbaum und Amartya Sen, Oxford, S. 270–76.
- 1999 [414] Nussbaum, Martha (1999): Virtue Ethics: A Misleading Category?, *Journal of Ethics* 3, S. 163–201.<sup>120</sup>

---

<sup>120</sup> “Virtue ethics is standardly taught and discussed as a distinctive approach to the major questions of ethics, a third major position alongside Utilitarian and Kantian ethics. I argue that this taxonomy is a confusion. Both Utilitarianism and Kantianism contain treatments of virtue, so virtue ethics cannot possibly be a separate approach contrasted with those approaches. There are, to be sure, quite a few contemporary philosophical writers about virtue who are neither Utilitarians nor Kantians; many of these find inspiration in ancient Greek theories of virtue. But even here there is little unity. Although certain concerns do unite this disparate group (a concern for the role of motives and passions in good choice, a concern for character, and a concern for the whole course of an agent’s life), there are equally profound disagreements, especially concerning the role that reason should play in ethics. One group of modern virtue-theorists, I argue, are primarily anti-Utilitarians, concerned with the plurality of value and the susceptibility of passions to social cultivation. These theorists want to enlarge the place of reason in ethics. They hold that reason can deliberate about ends as well as means, and that reason can modify the passions themselves. Another group of virtue theorists are primarily anti-Kantians. They believe that reason plays too dominant a role in most philosophical accounts of ethics, and that a larger place should be given to sentiments and passions – which they typically construe in a less reason-based way than does the first group. The paper investigates these differences, concluding that it is not helpful to speak of “virtue ethics,” and that we would be better

- 1996 [415] Oakley, Justin (1996): Varieties of Virtue Ethics, *Ratio (New Series)* 9, S. 128–52.
- 1998 [416] Oakley, Justin (1998): A Virtue Ethics Approach, in *A Companion to Bioethics*, hrsg. von Helga Kuhse und Peter Singer, Oxford, S. 86–97.
- 2007 [417] Oakley, Justin (2007): Virtue Theory, in *Principles of Health Care Ethics*, Second Edition, hrsg. von R.E. Ashcroft, A. Dawson, H. Draper und J.R. McMillan, Chichester, S. 87–91.
- 2013 [418] Oakley, Justin (2013): Virtue Ethics and Bioethics, in *Cambridge Companion to Virtue Ethics*, hrsg. von Daniel C. Russell, Cambridge, S. 197–220.
- 2016 [419] Oakley, Justin (2016): Diagnosing True Virtue. Remote Scenarios, Warranted Virtue Attributions, and Virtuous Medical Practice, *Theoretical Medicine and Bioethics* 37, S. 85–96.<sup>121</sup>
- 2018 [420] Oakley, Justin (2018): Toward an Empirically Informed Approach to Medical Virtues, in *The Oxford Handbook of Virtue*, hrsg. von Nancy E. Snow, Oxford, S. 571–90.
- 2001 [421] Oakley, Justin/Cocking, Dean (2001): *Virtue Ethics and Professional Roles*, Cambridge.
- 1988 [422] O'Connor, David (1988): Aristotelian Justice as a Personal Virtue, in *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* Vol. XIII: *Ethical Theory: Character and Virtue*, hrsg. von Peter A. French, Theodore E. Uehling, Jr. und Howard K. Wettstein, Notre Dame, S. 417–27.
- 1999 [423] Oderberg, David S. (1999): On the Cardinality of the Cardinal Virtues, *International Journal of Philosophical Studies* 7, S. 305–22.<sup>122</sup>

---

off characterizing the substantive views of each thinker – and then figuring out what we ourselves want to say.”

<sup>121</sup> “Immanuel Kant argues in the *Foundations* that remote scenarios are diagnostic of genuine virtue. When agents commonly thought to have a particular virtue fail to exhibit that virtue in an extreme situation, he argues, they do not truly have the virtue at all, and our propensities to fail in such ways indicate that true virtue might never have existed. Kant’s suggestion that failure to show, say, courage in extraordinary circumstances necessarily silences one’s claim to have genuine courage seems to rely on an implausibly demanding standard for warranted virtue attributions. In contrast to this approach, some philosophers—such as Robert Adams and John Doris—have argued for probabilistic accounts of warranted virtue attributions. But despite the initial plausibility of such accounts, I argue that a sole reliance on probabilistic approaches is inadequate, as they are insufficiently sensitive to considerations of credit and fault, which emerge when agents have developed various insurance strategies and protective capacities against their responding poorly to particular eventualities. I also argue that medical graduates should develop the sorts of virtuous dispositions necessary to protect patient welfare against various countervailing influences (even where such influences might be encountered only rarely), and that repeated failures to uphold the proper goals of medicine in emergency scenarios might indeed be diagnostic of whether an individual practitioner does have the relevant medical virtue. In closing, I consider the dispositions involved in friendship. I seek to develop a principled way of determining when remote scenarios can be illuminating of genuine friendship and genuine virtue.”

<sup>122</sup> “This paper is a detailed study of what are traditionally called the cardinal virtues: prudence, justice, temperance and fortitude. I defend what I call the Cardinality Thesis, that the traditional four and no others are cardinal. I define cardinality in terms of three sub-theses, the first being that the cardinal virtues are jointly necessary for the possession of every other virtue, the second that each of the other virtues is a species of one of the four cardinals, and the third that many of the other virtues are also auxiliaries of one

- 2000 [424] Oderberg, David S. (2000): *Moral Theory. A Non-Consequentialist Approach*, Oxford, S. 45–53 (“Virtue”).
- 2002 [425] Oderberg, David (2002): Review of Hursthouse, *On Virtue Ethics*, *Philosophical Books* 43, S. 159–63.
- 1996 [426] Okin, Susan Moller (1996): Feminism, Moral Development, and the Virtues, in *How Should One Live? Essays on the Virtues*, hrsg. von Roger Crisp, Oxford, S. 211–29.
- 2011 [427] Olsthoorn, Peter (2011): *Military Ethics and Virtues. An Interdisciplinary Approach for the 21st Century*, Abingdon.<sup>123</sup>
- 1993 [428] O’Neill, Onora (1993): Duties and Virtues, in *Ethics*, hrsg. von A. Phillips Griffiths, Cambridge, S. 107–20.
- 1996 [429] O’Neill, Onora (1996): Kant’s Virtues, in *How Should One Live? Essays on the Virtues*, hrsg. von Roger Crisp, Oxford, S. 77–97.
- 1996 [430] O’Neill, Onora (1996): *Towards Justice and Virtue. A Constructive Account of Practical Reasoning*, Cambridge. – *Tugend und Gerechtigkeit: eine konstruktive Darstellung des praktischen Denkens*, Berlin 1996.
- 2004 [431] O’Neill, Onora (2004): Consequences for Non-consequentialists, *Utilitas* 16, S. 1–11.<sup>124</sup> – Zu [191].
- 2025 [432] Panizza, Silvia Caprioglio/Vaccarezza, Maria Silvia (2025): Moral Transformation as Shifting (Im)Possibilities, *The Journal of Ethics* 29, S. 195–210.<sup>125</sup>

---

or more cardinals. I provide abstract arguments for each sub-thesis, followed by illustration from concrete cases. I then use these results to shed light on the two fundamental problems of the acquisition of the virtues and their unity, proving some further theses in the latter case.”

<sup>123</sup> Contents: 1 Virtue ethics and the military. 2 Honor. 3 Courage. 4 Loyalty. 5 Integrity. 6 Respect. 7 Conclusion. Notes. References. Index.

<sup>124</sup> “Both consequentialist and non-consequentialist ethical reasoning have difficulties in accounting for the value of consequences. Taken neat, consequentialism is too fierce in its emphasis on success and disregard of luck, while non-consequentialism seemingly over-values inner states and undervalues actual results. In *Uneasy Virtue* Julia Driver proposes a form of objective consequentialism which claims that characters are good if they typically (but not invariably) produce good results. This position addresses the problems moral luck raises for consequentialism, but requires some form of realism about traits of character. However, if our knowledge of mental states is ascriptive, this form of objective consequentialism may make excessive demands. Non-consequentialists may gain in so far as the theories of action to which they are typically committed are less demanding, and are built to take account of the typical or systematic connections between states of character and results of action.”

<sup>125</sup> “The phenomenon of moral transformation, though important, has received little attention in virtue ethics. In this paper we propose a virtue-ethical model of moral transformation as character transformation by tracking the development of new identity-defining (‘core’) character traits, their expressions, and their priority structure, through the change in what appears as possible or impossible to the moral agent. We propose that character transformation culminates when what previously appeared as morally possible to the agent now appears impossible, i.e. unconceived and unthinkable, moving through stages of transformation where some possibilities gradually disappear while others open up. While we show an example

- 1998 [433] Paul, Ellen Frankel/Miller, Jr., Fred D./Paul, Jeffrey (Hrsg.) (1998): *Virtue and Vice*, Cambridge.
- 1984 [434] Pence, Greg (1984): Recent Work on the Virtues, *American Philosophical Quarterly* 21, S. 281–97.
- 1991 [435] Pence, Greg (1991): Virtue Theory, in *A Companion to Ethics*, hrsg. von Peter Singer, Oxford, S. 249–58.
- 1992 [436] Perry, Michael J. (1992): Virtues and Relativism, in *Virtue, Nomos* 34, hrsg. von John W. Chapman und William A. Galston, New York, S. 117–31.
- 2011 [437] Pettigrove, Glen (2011): Is Virtue Ethics Self-Effacing?, *Journal of Ethics* 15, S. 191–207.<sup>126</sup>
- 2018 [438] Pettigrove, Glen (2018): Alternatives to Neo-Aristotelian Virtue Ethics, in *The Oxford Handbook of Virtue*, hrsg. von Nancy E. Snow, Oxford, S. 359–76.
- 2013 [439] Pianalto, Matthew (2013): Humility and Environmental Virtue Ethics, in *Virtues in Action. New Essays in Applied Virtue Ethics*, hrsg. von Michael W. Austin, Houndmills, Basingstoke, S. 132–49.
- 2016 [440] Pianalto, Matthew (2016): *On Patience: Reclaiming a Foundational Virtue*, Lanham.
- 1971 [441] Pincoffs, Edmund L. (1971): Quandary Ethics, *Mind* 80, S. 552–71. Wiederabgedruckt in *Ethical Theory*, hrsg. von James Rachels, Oxford 1998, S. 435–53.
- 1986 [442] Pincoffs, Edmund L. (1986): *Quandaries and Virtues. Against Reductivism in Ethics*, Lawrence.
- 1992 [443] Pincoffs, Edmund L. (1992): Virtues, in *Encyclopedia of Ethics*, hrsg. von Lawrence C. Becker und Charlotte B. Becker, New York, London, Vol. II, S. 1283–1288.
- 2005 [444] Pleines, Jürgen-Eckardt (2005): Tugend zwischen Sittlichkeit und Moral, *Perspektiven der Philosophie. Neues Jahrbuch* 31, S. 177–234.
- 1990 [445] Pojman, Louis P. (1990): *Ethics. Discovering Right and Wrong*, Belmont, Cal., S. 114–35 (“Virtue-Based Ethical Systems”).
- 2003 [446] Pollard, Bill (2003): Can Virtuous Actions be Both Habitual and Rational?, *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* 6, S. 411–25.<sup>127</sup>

---

of moral transformation towards virtue, we allow that such transformation can occur in the opposite direction, hence we make claims about ‘character traits’ rather than virtues of vices. Through the example of former slave-trader Rodrigo’s transformation in the film *The Mission*, we follow the parallel development of new objects of value and ways of valuing (with respect to a group of indigenous people of South America) with the closing down of the possibility of disrespecting and harming them, to the end-point of transformation, where allowing their capture is for Rodrigo both unconceived and, when conceived, unthinkable.”

<sup>126</sup> “Thomas Hurka, Simon Keller, and Julia Annas have recently argued that virtue ethics is self-effacing. I contend that these arguments are rooted in a mistaken understanding of the role that ideal agency and agent flourishing (should) play in virtue ethics. I then show how a virtue ethical theory can avoid the charge of self-effacement and why it is important that it do so.”

<sup>127</sup> “Virtuous actions seem to be both habitual and rational. But if we combine an intuitive understanding of habituality with the currently predominant paradigm of rational action, these two features of virtuous actions are hard to reconcile. Intuitively, acting habitually is acting as one has before in similar contexts, and

- 1991 [447] Poole, Ross (1991): *Morality and Modernity*, London, S. 56–64.
- 2013 [448] Porter, Jean (2013): Virtue Ethics in the Medieval Period, in *Cambridge Companion to Virtue Ethics*, hrsg. von Daniel C. Russell, Cambridge, S.70–91.
- 1997 [449] Preußner, Andreas (1997): *Die Komplexität der Tugend: eine historisch-systematische Untersuchung*, Würzburg: Königshausen & Neumann (Epistemata: Reihe Philosophie 199, Zugl.: Wuppertal, Univ., Diss., 1995)
- 2009 [450] Prinz, Jesse (2009): The Normativity Challenge: Cultural Psychology Provides the Real Threat to Virtue Ethics, *Journal of Ethics* 13, S. 117–44.<sup>128</sup>
- 1991 [451] Prior, William J. (1991): *Virtue and Knowledge. An Introduction to Ancient Greek Ethics*, London.
- 1987 [452] Putman, Daniel (1987): Virtue and Self-Deception, *Southern Journal of Philosophy* 25, S. 549–57.
- 1991 [453] Putman, Daniel (1991): Relational Ethics and Virtue Theory, *Metaphilosophy* 22, S. 231–38.
- 1992 [454] Putman, Daniel (1992): Egoism and Virtue, *Journal of Value Inquiry* 26, S. 117–24.
- 1995 [455] Putman, Daniel (1995): The Primacy of Virtue in Children’s Moral Development, *Journal of Moral Education* 24, S. 175–184.
- 1997 [456] Putman, Daniel (1997): The Intellectual Bias of Virtue Ethics, *Philosophy* 72, S. 303–11.
- 1998 [457] Putman, Daniel (1998): *Human Excellence. Dialogues on Virtue Theory*, Lanham.
- 1988 [458] Putnam, Ruth Anna (1988): Reciprocity and Virtue Ethics, *Ethics* 98, S. 379–89.
- 1993 [459] Rachels, James (1993): *The Elements of Moral Philosophy*, New York, 2. Aufl., S. 159–79 (“The Ethics of Virtue”).
- 2011 [460] Railton, Peter (2011): Two Cheers for Virtue: Or, Might Virtue be Habit Forming?, *Oxford Studies in Normative Ethics* Vol. I, Oxford, S. 295–329.
- 1998 [461] Ramsay, Hayden (1998): Natural Virtue, *Dialogue* 37, S. 341–60.
- 2010 [462] Ransome, William (2010): Is Agent-Based Virtue Ethics Self-Undermining?, *Ethical Perspectives*

---

automatically, that is, without thinking about it. Meanwhile, contemporary philosophers tend to assume the truth of what I call “the reasons theory of rational action”, which states that all rational actions are “actions for reasons”. Whilst interpretations of this phrase are disputed, I argue that neither of the two leading views – which I call “reasons internalism” and “reasons externalism” – makes room for habitual actions to count as actions for reasons; by the reasons theory, they cannot be rational either. I suggest one way of effecting the reconciliation which, whilst it allows us to keep the reasons theory, requires us to conceive of reasons as even more radically external than current externalists believe them to be.”

<sup>128</sup> “Situationists argue that virtue ethics is empirically untenable, since traditional virtue ethicists postulate broad, efficacious character traits, and social psychology suggests that such traits do not exist. I argue that prominent philosophical replies to this challenge do not succeed. But cross-cultural research gives reason to postulate character traits, and this undermines the situationist critique. There is, however, another empirical challenge to virtue ethics that is harder to escape. Character traits are culturally informed, as are our ideals of what traits are virtuous, and our ideals of what qualifies as well-being. If virtues and well-being are culturally constructed ideals, then the standard strategy for grounding the normativity of virtue ethics in human nature is undermined.”

- 2021 [463] Ratti, Emanuele/Stapleford, Thomas A. (Hrsg.) (2021): *Science, Technology, and Virtues. Contemporary Perspectives*, Oxford.
- 2001 [464] Read, Rupert (2001): Review of Rosalind Hursthouse, *On Virtue Ethics*, *Philosophical Investigations* 24, S. 274–82.
- 2000 [465] Reader, Soran (2000): New Directions in Ethics: Naturalisms, Reasons and Virtue, *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* 3, S. 341–64.
- 2016 [466] Rees, Clea F. (2016): A Virtue Ethics Response to Implicit Bias, in *Implicit Bias and Philosophy Volume 2: Moral Responsibility, Structural Injustice, and Ethics*, hrsg. von Michael Brownstein und Jennifer Saul, Oxford, 191–214.
- 1997 [467] Reese-Schäfer, Walter (1997): *Grenzgötter der Moral. Der neuere europäisch-amerikanische Diskurs zur politischen Ethik*, Frankfurt a. M., S. 309–61 („Demokratische Tugendlehre“).
- 1988 [468] Regan, S.J., Richard J. (1988): Virtue, Religion, and Civic Culture, in *Midwest Studies in Philosophy Vol. XIII: Ethical Theory: Character and Virtue*, hrsg. von Peter A. French, Theodore E. Uehling, Jr. und Howard K. Wettstein, Notre Dame, S. 342–51.
- 2003 [469] Rehg, William und Davis, Darin (2003): Conceptual Gerrymandering? The Alignment of Hursthouse’s Naturalistic Virtue Ethics with Neo-Kantian Non-Naturalism, *Southern Journal of Philosophy* 41, S. 583–600.
- 2006 [470] Reshotko, Naomi (2006): *Socratic Virtue. Making the Best of the Neither-Good-nor-Bad*, Cambridge.
- 2001 [471] Rhonheimer, Martin (2001): *Die Perspektive der Moral. Philosophische Grundlagen der Tugendethik*, Berlin.
- 1999 [472] Richter, Duncan (1999): Virtue Without Theory, *Journal of Value Inquiry* 33, S. 353–69.
- 1994 [473] Richardson, Henry S. (1994): Rescuing Ethical Theory, *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 54, S. 703–8. (Zu M. Slote, *From Morality to Virtue*)
- 1998 [474] Rippe, Klaus Peter/Schaber, Peter (1998): Einleitung, in dies. (Hrsg.), *Tugendethik*, Stuttgart, S. 7–18.
- 1998 [475] Rippe, Klaus Peter/Schaber, Peter (Hrsg.) (1998): *Tugendethik*, Stuttgart.
- 1991 [476] Roberts, Robert C. (1991): Virtues and Rules, *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 51, S. 325–43.
- 2020 [477] Rogers, Tristan J. (2020): Virtue Ethics and Political Authority, *Journal of Social Philosophy* 51, S.

---

<sup>129</sup> “Agent-based virtue ethics strives to offer a viable account of both moral conduct and the source of moral value, independent of ‘deontic’ teleological and deontological characterizations. One of its chief proponents offers an agent-based virtue-ethical account that aspires to derive all moral value, including the moral status of actions, solely from the ‘aretaic’ concept of benevolence. I suggest that morality as benevolence fails to offer a viable account of either virtuous moral conduct or the source of moral value, because it is selfundermining in both respects. In order to solve this structural problem, it appears as if the theory may have to give up its agent-based status.”

- 1988 [478] Rorty, Amelie Oksenberg (1988): Virtues and Their Vicissitudes, in *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* Vol. XIII: *Ethical Theory: Character and Virtue*, hrsg. von Peter A. French, Theodore E. Uehling, Jr. und Howard K. Wettstein, Notre Dame, S. 136–48.
- 2012 [479] Ross, Allison/Athanassoulis Nafsika (2012): Risk and Virtue Ethics, in *Handbook of Risk Theory: Epistemology, Decision Theory, Ethics, and Social Implications of Risk*, hrsg. von Sabine Roeser, Rafaela Hillerbrand, Per Sandin und Martin Peterson, Dordrecht, S. 833–56.
- 2016 [480] Rossi, Mauro/Tappolet, Christine (2016): Virtue, Happiness, and Well-Being, *Monist* 99, S. 112–27.<sup>130</sup>
- 1996 [481] Roughley, Neil (1996): Tugend, in *Enzyklopädie Philosophie und Wissenschaftstheorie* Bd. 4, hrsg. von Jürgen Mittelstraß, Stuttgart, S. 344–50.
- 2022 [482] Runge, Richard Friedrich (2022): Die innere Dynamik von selbst- und umweltbezogenen Tugenden im tugendhaften Akteur. Systematische Überlegungen im Ausgang von Erich Fromm, *Zeitschrift für Ethik und Moralphilosophie* 5, S. 37–59.<sup>131</sup>

---

<sup>130</sup> “What is the relation between virtue and well-being? Our claim is that, under certain conditions, virtue necessarily tends to have a positive impact on an individual’s well-being. This is so because of the connection between virtue and psychological happiness, on the one hand, and between psychological happiness and well-being, on the other hand. In particular we defend three claims: that virtue is constituted by a disposition to experience fitting emotions, that fitting emotions are constituents of fitting happiness, and that fitting happiness is a constituent of well-being. What follows is that, under certain conditions, virtue disposes the individual to experience well-being-constituting states. We end with a discussion of two objections that may be raised against our proposal.”

<sup>131</sup> “Die eudaimonistische Tugendethik sieht sich, was ihre innere Struktur anbelangt, standardmäßig mit den Vorwürfen des Egoismus und Anthropozentrismus konfrontiert, was auch das Projekt einer ökologischen Tugendethik zu gefährden scheint. Der vorliegende Artikel versucht, ausgehend von der Tugendethik Erich Fromms, eine neue Perspektive auf diese Standardvorwürfe zu entwickeln, indem er den theoretischen Implikationen nachgeht, die die Anerkennung der Biophilie – der Liebe zum Leben – als eine der Tugenden des Menschen für den Frommschen Ansatz hat. Die zunächst noch exegetisch ausgerichtete Diskussion der werkiternen Relation von humanistischer und biophiler Ethik bei Erich Fromm leitet schließlich zu einer stärker systematisch ausgerichteten Diskussion der inneren Dynamik von selbst- und umweltbezogenen Tugenden im tugendhaften Akteur über. In diesem Zuge wird deutlich gemacht, dass das selbstbezogene Streben nach eigener Eudaimonie und das umweltbezogene Streben nach der Förderung des Objekts der eigenen Liebe zwar durchaus miteinander in einen Konflikt geraten können, dass dieser Konflikt aber nicht zur Selbstauslöschung der Tugendethik führt, sondern stattdessen im tugendhaften Akteur eine produktive Dynamik entfaltet. Die klassische Gegenüberstellung von Anthropozentrismus und Biozentrismus innerhalb der Ethik lässt sich auf diese Weise unterlaufen.”

- 2023 [483] Runge, Richard Friedrich (2023): *Eine kritische Theorie der Tugendethik*, Frankfurt a. M.<sup>132</sup>
- 2024 [484] Runge, Richard Friedrich (2024): Neo-Aristotelian Naturalism, Local Ethical Supervenience, and the Beneficial Character of Virtue, *Zeitschrift für Ethik und Moralphilosophie* 7, S. 23–46<sup>133</sup>.
- 2008 [485] Russell, Daniel C. (2008): Agent-Based Virtue Ethics and the Fundamentality of Virtue, *American Philosophical Quarterly* 45, S. 329–48.
- 2008 [486] Russell, Daniel C. (2008): That “Ought” Does Not Imply “Right”: Why It Matters for Virtue Ethics, *Southern Journal of Philosophy* 46, S. 299–315.
- 2009 [487] Russell, Daniel C. (2009): *Practical Intelligence and the Virtues*, Oxford.<sup>134</sup>

---

<sup>132</sup> „Der neo-aristotelischen Tugendethik zufolge hängen ethische Maßstäbe von der biologischen Spezieszugehörigkeit der ethischen Akteure ab. Diese Perspektive, so argumentiert Richard Friedrich Runge in seinem Buch, bleibt bislang unbefriedigend. Unter Einbeziehung der modernen philosophischen Biologie und der dialektischen Anthropologie von Erich Fromm plädiert der Autor für eine kritische Wendung der Tugendethik und ein dialektisches Verständnis der Beziehung von Individuum und Umwelt. Seine kritische Theorie der Tugendethik ist der Versuch eines großen systematischen Neuentwurfs in einer der bestimmenden metaethischen Debatten unserer Zeit.“

<sup>133</sup> “This article explores the ambivalent relationship of neo-Aristotelian naturalism to ethical supervenience. One of the main proponents of this approach, Michael Thompson, holds a position that leads to a rejection of local ethical supervenience. It is argued that this rejection implicitly undermines a premise held by other prominent neo-Aristotelian naturalists, such as Philippa Foot or Rosalind Hursthouse, who implemented Thompson’s species-relative logic of ethical evaluations into their theories. This premise—that there is a systematic connection between the virtuous life and the benefit of the individual—could be re-established if neo-Aristotelian naturalism abandoned the species-essentialist understanding of life-forms and instead accepted local ethical supervenience as an ethical frame of reference. Although this article derives its problem from the main works of the aforementioned authors, its interest lies not mainly in exegesis, but in the systematic discussion of the logical status and the functionality of the concept of life-form in neo-Aristotelian naturalism. This discussion will be enriched by the inclusion of the logical distinctions and insights from modern philosophical biology.”

<sup>134</sup> Publisher’s Description: “One of the most important developments in modern moral philosophy is the resurgence of interest in the virtues. In this new book, Daniel Russell explores two important hopes for such an approach to moral thought: that starting from the virtues should cast light on what makes an action right, and that notions like character, virtue, and vice should yield a plausible picture of human psychology. Russell argues that the key to each of these hopes is an understanding of the cognitive and deliberative skills involved in the virtues. If right action is defined in terms of acting generously or kindly, then these virtues must involve skills for determining what the kind or generous thing to do would be on a given occasion. Likewise, Russell argues that understanding virtuous action as the intelligent pursuit of virtuous goals yields a promising picture of the psychology of virtue. This book develops an Aristotelian account of the virtue of practical intelligence or ‘phronesis’ – an excellence of deliberating and making choices – which Russell argues is a necessary part of every virtue. This emphasis on the roots of the virtues in the practical intellect contrasts with ambivalence about the practical intellect in much recent work on the virtues – a trend Russell argues is ultimately perilous for virtue theory. This book also takes a penetrating look at issues like the unity of the virtues, responsibility for character, and that elusive figure, ‘the virtuous person’.

- 2013 [488] Russell, Daniel C. (2013): *Virtue Ethics and Political Philosophy*, in *Routledge Companion to Social and Political Philosophy*, hrsg. von Gerald Gaus und Fred D'Agostino, Abingdon, S. 364–74.
- 2013 [489] Russell, Daniel C. (2013): *Virtue Ethics, Happiness, and the Good Life*, in *Cambridge Companion to Virtue Ethics*, hrsg. von Daniel C. Russell, Cambridge, S. 7–28.
- 2018 [490] Russell, Daniel C. (2018): *Putting Ideals in Their Place*, in *The Oxford Handbook of Virtue*, hrsg. von Nancy E. Snow, Oxford, S. 432–52.
- 2013 [491] Russell, Daniel C. (Hrsg.) (2013): *Cambridge Companion to Virtue Ethics*, Cambridge.
- 2013 [492] Russell, Paul (2013): *Hume's Anatomy of Virtue*, in *Cambridge Companion to Virtue Ethics*, hrsg. von Daniel C. Russell, Cambridge, S. 92–123.
- 2005 [493] Sabini, John/Silver, Maury (2005): *Lack of Character? Situationism Critiqued*, *Ethics* 115, S. 535–62.
- 2021 [494] Sandis, Constantine (2021): *Virtue Ethics and Particularism*, *Aristotelian Society Supplementary Volume* 95, S. 205–32.<sup>135</sup> – Dazu: [129].
- 2005 [495] Sandler, Ronald (2005): *Ignorance and Virtue*, *Philosophical Papers* 34, S. 261–72.<sup>136</sup>
- 2005 [496] Sandler, Ronald (2005): *What Makes a Character Trait a Virtue?*, *Journal of Value Inquiry* 39, S. 383–97.

---

Written in a clear and careful manner, *Practical Intelligence and the Virtues* will appeal to philosophers and students alike in moral philosophy and moral psychology.”

Contents: 1. Practical Intelligence and the Virtues: An Aristotelian Approach. Part 1. Phronesis, Virtue, and Right Action. 2. Right Action for Virtue Ethics. 3. Right Action and Virtuous Motives. 4. Right Action and ‘the Virtuous Person’. Part 2. The Enumeration Problem. 5. The Enumeration Problem. 6. Individuating the Virtues. 7. Magnificence, Generosity, and Subordination. Part 3. Situations, Dispositions, and Virtues. 8. Situations and Broad-Based Dispositions. 9. Situations and Dispositions: Examining the Evidence. 10. From Situationism to Virtue Theory. Part 4. Defending Hard Virtue Theory. 11. Phronesis and the Unity of the Virtues. 12. Responsibility for Character. Works Cited. Index Locorum. General Index.

<sup>135</sup> “Moral particularism is often conceived as the view that there are no moral principles. However, its most fêted accounts focus almost exclusively on rules regarding actions and their features. Such action-centred particularism is, I argue, compatible with generalism at the level of character traits. The resulting view is a form of particularist virtue ethics. This endorses directives of the form ‘Be X’ but rejects any implication that the relevant X-ness must therefore always count in favour of an action.”

<sup>136</sup> “Julia Driver has argued that there is a class of virtues that are compatible with or even require that an agent be ignorant in some respect. In this paper I argue for an alternative conception of the relationship between ignorance and virtue. The dispositions constitutive of virtue must include sensitivity to human limitations and fallibility. In this way the virtues accommodate ignorance, rather than require or promote it. I develop my account by considering two virtues in particular: tolerance (the paradigm for my account) and modesty (which Driver employs as the paradigm for her account). Although several philosophers have offered alternatives to Driver's account of modesty and others have discussed tolerance as a moral virtue, an adequate account of the role of ignorance in the specification of the virtues generally has yet to be provided. I believe that similarities between the two virtues are instructive for defining that role.”

- 2015 [497] Sanford, Jonathan J. (2015): *Before Virtue: Assessing Contemporary Virtue Ethics*, Washington, D. C.
- 1993 [498] Santas, Gerasimos X. (1993): Does Aristotle Have a Virtue Ethics?, *Philosophical Inquiry* 15. Wiederabgedruckt (in revidierter Version) in *Virtue Ethics. A Critical Reader*, hrsg. von Daniel Statman, Edinburgh 1997, S. 260–85.
- 2015 [499] Sarkar, Husain (2015): Annas: The Just Soul, the Community, and the Circularity Objection, *Dialogue* 54, S. 159–84.<sup>137</sup>
- 2015 [500] Sarkar, Husain (2015): Annas: Virtuous Person, Relativism, and the Circularity Objection, *Dialogue* 54, S. 285–311.<sup>138</sup>
- 2012 [501] Scarre, Geoffrey (2012): The Continence of Virtue, *Philosophical Investigations* 36, S. 1–19.<sup>139</sup>
- 1990 [502] Schaller, Walter E. (1990): Are Virtues No More Than Dispositions to Obey Moral Rules?, *Philosophia* 20, S. 195–207.
- 1990 [503] Schneewind, J. B. (1990): The Misfortunes of Virtue, *Ethics* 101, S. 42–63. Wiederabgedruckt in *Virtue Ethics*, hrsg. von Roger Crisp und Michael Slote, Oxford 1997, S. 178–200.
- 2015 [504] Schroeder, Nicholas (2015): The Problem of Continence in Contemporary Virtue Ethics, *Journal of Ethics* 19, S. 85–104.<sup>140</sup>

---

<sup>137</sup> “Annas’ virtue ethics faces the Circularity Objection. She claims that a just soul is disposed to doing just acts. If a just soul is defined neither in terms of right acts nor rules, then the Circularity Objection is circumvented. Drawing upon Korsgaard’s recent work, it is shown that Annas’ argument faces anew the Circularity Objection. Then, I examine Annas’ fresh attempts to avert the Circularity Objection by appealing to the community of the virtuous. I argue that this move does not save her theory from either relativism or the Circularity Objection.”

<sup>138</sup> “This paper is informed by two principles: the Partiality Principle and the Impartiality Principle. Relying upon a relatively-unknown argument in Kant, the latter principle is stated and defended. The former principle is shown to be connected to Annas’ claim, in her theory of virtue ethics, that no mature, responsible adult wants to be told what to do, as well as to her developmental account of teaching and learning of virtue. I argue that Annas’ theory of virtue ethics is susceptible, as Kant’s theory is not, either to the Circularity Objection or (inclusive) to the Relativism Objection.”

<sup>139</sup> “Many recent writers in the virtue ethics tradition have followed Aristotle in arguing for a distinction between virtue and continence, where the latter is conceived as an inferior moral condition. In this paper I contend that rather than seeking to identify a sharp categorical difference between virtue and continence, we should see the contrast as rather one of degree, where virtue is a continence that has matured with practice and habit, becoming more stable, effective and self-aware.”

<sup>140</sup> “The harmony thesis claims that a virtuous agent will not experience inner conflict or pain when acting. The continent agent, on the other hand, is conflicted or pained when acting virtuously, making him inferior to the virtuous agent. But following Karen Stohr’s counterexample, we can imagine a case like a company owner who needs to fire some of her employees to save her company, where acting with conflict or pain is not only appropriate, but necessary in the situation. This creates a problem for virtue ethicists because the virtue/continence distinction cannot easily be drawn in the case. One solution offered by Stohr is to claim that a virtuous agent will respond with an intensity of feeling corresponding to her correct judgment, whereas a continent agent will miss the mark: he will feel too much or too little pain in response to his

- 1995 [505] Schroeter, François (1995): Tugend und Moraltheorie, *Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung* 49, S. 104–23.
- 1997 [506] Schuster, Josef (1997): *Moralisches Können. Studien zur Tugendethik*, Würzburg.
- 2004 [507] Schuster, Josef (2004): Gefühle und ethische Tugenden, in *Abwägende Vernunft. Praktische Rationalität in historischer, systematischer und religionsphilosophischer Perspektive*, hrsg. von Franz-Josef Bormann und Christian Schröer, Berlin, S. 361–80.
- 1974 [508] Seeskin, Kenneth (1974): Courage and Knowledge: A Perspective on the Socratic Paradox, *Southern Journal of Philosophy* 14, S. 511–21.
- 2007 [509] Setiya, Kieran (2007): *Reasons without Rationalism*, Princeton.<sup>141</sup>
- 1991 [510] Seung, T. K. (Hrsg.) (1991): The Nature of Virtue Ethics: its Political Relevance. A Conference Honoring Edmund L. Pincoffs, *Social Theory and Practice* 17 (2), S. 137–344.
- 1999 [511] Shaw, William H. (1999): *Contemporary Ethics. Taking Account of Utilitarianism*, Oxford, S. 252–61.
- 1992 [512] Sher, George (1992): Knowing about Virtue, in *Virtue (Nomos 34)*, hrsg. von John W. Chapman

---

correct judgment of value. This demarcation, I argue, is too strict because it entails something like a mean resembling a moral virtue or vice regarding pain, being inconsistent with our ordinary understanding of continence. In dealing with the difficulty, I argue that Aristotle's (largely neglected) virtue of endurance is better suited to account for the problem case. The following move explains why the case of the company owner is problematic: the company owner was missing a virtue on which we did not have the conceptual resources to elaborate. This points to a deeper problem in virtue ethics (there being an incomplete account of the virtues) that needs to be addressed."

<sup>141</sup> "Modern philosophy has been vexed by the question "Why should I be moral?" and by doubts about the rational authority of moral virtue. In *Reasons without Rationalism*, Kieran Setiya shows that these doubts rest on a mistake. The "should" of practical reason cannot be understood apart from the virtues of character, including such moral virtues as justice and benevolence, and the considerations to which the virtues make one sensitive thereby count as reasons to act. Proposing a new framework for debates about practical reason, Setiya argues that the only alternative to this "virtue theory" is a form of ethical rationalism in which reasons derive from the nature of intentional action. Despite its recent popularity, however, ethical rationalism is false. It wrongly assumes that we act "under the guise of the good," or it relies on dubious views about intention and motivation. It follows from the failure of rationalism that the virtue theory is true: we cannot be fully good without the perfection of practical reason, or have that perfection without being good. Addressing such topics as the psychology of virtue and the explanation of action, *Reasons without Rationalism* is essential reading for philosophers interested in ethics, rationality, or the philosophy of mind."

Contents: Preface ix – Introduction 1 – 1. "Squeezing the Good into the Right through the Tubes of Imperfection" 7 – 2. The Relevance of Action Theory 14 – PART ONE: Explaining Action 21 – 1. A Puzzle about Intention 23 – 2. The Belief-Desire Model 28 – 3. Acting for Reasons 39 – 4. Solving the Puzzle 48 – 5. A Causal Theory of Action? 56 – 6. Against the Guise of the Good 59 – PART TWO: Why Virtue Matters to the Study of Practical Reason 68 – 1. Character and Practical Thought 70 – 2. An Argument for the Virtue Theory 79 – 3. Practical Reason and the Guise of the Good 86 – 4. Motivation and Desire 99 – 5. Self-Knowledge as the Aim of Action 107 – Conclusion 116 – Bibliography 121 – Index 129.

und William A. Galston, New York, S. 91–116.

- 1988 [513] Sherman, Nancy (1988): Common Sense and Uncommon Virtue, in *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* Vol. XIII: *Ethical Theory: Character and Virtue*, hrsg. von Peter A. French, Theodore E. Uehling, Jr. und Howard K. Wettstein, Notre Dame, S. 97–114.
- 1989 [514] Sherman, Nancy (1989): *The Fabric of Character. Aristotle's Theory of Virtue*, Oxford.
- 1993 [515] Sherman, Nancy (1993): The Virtues of Common Pursuit, *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 53, S. 277–99.
- 1997 [516] Sherman, Nancy (1997): Kantian Virtue: Priggish or Passional?, in *Reclaiming the History of Ethics. Essays for John Rawls*, hrsg. von Andrews Reath, Barbara Herman und Christine M. Korsgaard, Cambridge, S. 270–96.
- 1997 [517] Sherman, Nancy (1997): *Making a Necessity of Virtue. Aristotle and Kant on Virtue*, Cambridge.
- 1997 [518] Sherman, Nancy (2005): The Look and Feel of Virtue, in *Virtue, Norms, and Objectivity. Issues in Ancient and Modern Ethics*, hrsg. von Christopher Gill, Oxford, S. 59–82.
- 2003 [519] Sherman, Nancy/White, Heath (2003): Intellectual Virtue: Emotions, Luck, and the Ancients, in *Intellectual Virtue – Perspectives from Ethics and Epistemology*, hrsg. von Micheal DePaul und Linda Zagzebski, Oxford, S. 34–54.
- 1992 [520] Shklar, Judith N. (1992): Justice without Virtue, in *Virtue (Nomos 34)*, hrsg. von John W. Chapman und William A. Galston, New York, S. 283–88.
- 2004 [521] Siep, Ludwig (2004): Vernunft und Tugend, in *Abwägende Vernunft. Praktische Rationalität in historischer, systematischer und religionsphilosophischer Perspektive*, hrsg. von Franz-Josef Bormann und Christian Schröer, Berlin, S. 344–60.
- 2005 [522] Siep, Ludwig (2005): Virtues, Values, and Moral Objectivity, in *Virtue, Norms, and Objectivity. Issues in Ancient and Modern Ethics*, hrsg. von Christopher Gill, Oxford, S. 83–98.
- 1992 [523] Simpson, Peter (1992): Contemporary Virtue Ethics and Aristotle, *Review of Metaphysics*, 46, S. 503–24. Wiederabgedruckt in *Virtue Ethics. A Critical Reader*, hrsg. von Daniel Statman, Edinburgh 1997, S. 245–59.
- 2017 [524] Sison, Alejo José G./Beabout, Gregory R./Ferrero, Ignacio (Hrsg.) (2017): *Handbook of Virtue Ethics in Business and Management*, Dordrecht.
- 1997 [525] Skillen, Tony (1997): Can Virtue be Taught – Especially these Days?, *Journal of Philosophy of Education* 31, S. 375–394.
- 2015 [526] Slingerland, Edward (2015): The Situationist Critique and Early Confucian Virtue Ethics, in *Cultivating Virtue. Perspectives from Philosophy, Theology, and Psychology*, hrsg. von Nancy E. Snow, Oxford, S.135–69.
- 1982 [527] Slote, Michael (1982): Is Virtue Possible?, *Analysis* 42, S. 70–76.
- 1983 [528] Slote, Michael (1983): *Goods and Virtues*, Oxford 1989 (mit neuem Vorwort 1989).
- 1988 [529] Slote, Michael (1988): Utilitarian Virtue, in *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* Vol. XIII: *Ethical Theory: Character and Virtue*, hrsg. von Peter A. French, Theodore E. Uehling, Jr. und Howard K. Wettstein, Notre Dame, S. 384–97.

- 1990 [530] Slote, Michael (1990): Some Advantages of Virtue Ethics, in *Identity, Character, and Morality. Essays in Moral Psychology*, hrsg. von Owen Flanagan und Amélie Oksenberg Rorty, Cambridge, Mass., S. 429–48.
- 1992 [531] Slote, Michael (1992): *From Morality to Virtue*, New York, Oxford.
- 1993 [532] Slote, Michael (1993): Virtue, in *A Companion to Contemporary Political Philosophy*, hrsg. von Robert E. Goodin und Philip Pettit, Oxford, S. 645–50.
- 1993 [533] Slote, Michael (1993): Virtue Ethics and Democratic Values, *Journal of Social Philosophy* 24, S. 5–37.
- 1994 [534] Slote, Michael (1994): Precis of “From Morality to Virtue”, *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 54, S. 683–87.
- 1994 [535] Slote, Michael (1994): Reply to Commentators, *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 54, S. 709–19.
- 1995 [536] Slote, Michael (1995): Law in Virtue Ethics, *Law and Philosophy* 14, S. 91–114.
- 1996 [537] Slote, Michael (1996): Agent-Based Virtue Ethics, *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* Vol. XX: *Moral Concepts*, S. 83–101. Wiederabgedruckt in *Virtue Ethics*, hrsg. von Roger Crisp und Michael Slote, Oxford 1997, S. 239–62.
- 1996 [538] Slote, Michael (1996): Virtue Ethics, Utilitarianism, and Symmetry, in *How Should One Live? Essays on the Virtues*, hrsg. von Roger Crisp, Oxford, S. 99–110.
- 1997 [539] Slote, Michael (1997): Virtue Ethics, in Marcia W. Baron, Philip Pettit, Michael Slote, *Three Methods of Ethics: A Debate*, Oxford, S. 175–238.
- 1997 [540] Slote, Michael (1997): The Virtue in Self-Interest, *Social Philosophy and Policy* 14, S. 264–285.
- 1998 [541] Slote, Michael (1998): The Justice of Caring, in *Virtue and Vice*, hrsg. von Ellen Frankel Paul, Fred D. Miller, Jr. und Jeffrey Paul, Cambridge, S. 171–95.
- 2000 [542] Slote, Michael (2000): Virtue Ethics, in *The Blackwell Guide to Ethical Theory*, hrsg. von Hugh LaFollette, Oxford, S. 325–47.
- 2001 [543] Slote, Michael (2001): *Morals from Motives*, Oxford.
- 2003 [544] Slote, Michael (2003): Sentimentalist Virtue and Moral Judgement: Outline of a Project, *Metaphilosophy* 34, S. 131–143.<sup>142</sup>

---

<sup>142</sup> “Ethical rationalism has recently dominated the philosophical landscape, but sentimentalist forms of normative ethics (such as the ethics of caring) and of metaethics (such as Blackburn’s projectivism and various ideal-observer and response-dependent views) have also been prominent. But none of this has been systematic in the manner of Hume and Hutcheson. Hume based both ethics and metaethics in his notion of sympathy, but the project sketched here focuses rather on the (related) notion of empathy. I argue that empathy is essential to the development of morally required caring about others and also to deontological limits or restrictions on self-concern and other-concern. But empathy also plays a grounding role in moral judgement. Moral approval and disapproval can be non-circularly understood as empathic reflections of the concern or lack of concern that agents show towards other people; and moral utterances can plausibly be seen not as projections, expressions, or descriptions of sentiment but as “objective” and

- 2004 [545] Slote, Michael (2004): Driver's Virtues, *Utilitas* 16, S. 22–32.<sup>143</sup> – Zu [191].
- 2018 [546] Slote, Michael (2018) : Sentimentalist Virtue Ethics, in *The Oxford Handbook of Virtue*, hrsg. von Nancy E. Snow, Oxford, S. 343–58.
- 2017 [547] Smith, Nicholas Ryan (2017): Right-Makers and the Targets of Virtue, *Journal of Value Inquiry* 51, S. 311–26. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10790-016-9571-8>.
- 1992 [548] Smith, Rogers M. (1992): On the Good of Knowing Virtue, in *Virtue (Nomos 34)*, hrsg. von John W. Chapman und William A. Galston, New York, S. 132–42.
- 2003 [549] Smith, R. Scott (2003): *Virtue Ethics and Moral Knowledge. Philosophy of Language after MacIntyre and Hauerwas*, Aldershot.
- 1999 [550] Smith, Tara (1999): Justice as a Personal Virtue, *Social Theory and Practice* 25, S. 361–84.
- 2008 [551] Snow, Nancy (2008): Virtue and Flourishing, *Journal of Social Philosophy* 39, S. 225–45.
- 2018 [552] Snow, Nancy (2018): Neo-Aristotelian Virtue Ethics, in *The Oxford Handbook of Virtue*, hrsg. von Nancy E. Snow, Oxford, S. 321–42.
- 2020 [553] Snow, Nancy (2020): *Contemporary Virtue Ethics*, Cambridge.
- 2015 [554] Snow, Nancy E. (Hrsg.) (2015): *Cultivating Virtue. Perspectives from Philosophy, Theology, and Psychology*, Oxford.
- 2018 [555] Snow, Nancy E. (Hrsg.) (2018): *The Oxford Handbook of Virtue*, Oxford.
- 2021 [556] Snow, Nancy E. (Hrsg.) (2021): *Virtues, Democracy, and Online Media: Ethical and Epistemic Issues*, New York und Abingdon.
- 1988 [557] Solomon, David (1988): Internal Objections to Virtue Ethics, in *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* Vol. XIII: *Ethical Theory: Character and Virtue*, Notre Dame, S. 428–41. Wiederabgedruckt in *Virtue Ethics. A Critical Reader*, hrsg. von Daniel Statman, Edinburgh 1997, S. 165–79.
- 2003 [558] Solomon, David (2003): Virtue Ethics: Radical or Routine? in *Intellectual Virtue – Perspectives from Ethics and Epistemology*, hrsg. von Micheal DePaul und Linda Zagzebski, Oxford, S. 57–80.
- 1988 [559] Solomon, Robert C. (1988): The Virtue of Love, in *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* Vol. XIII: *Ethical Theory: Character and Virtue*, hrsg. von Peter A. French, Theodore E. Uehling, Jr. und

---

“non-relative” judgements whose reference and content are fixed by sentiments of approval and disapproval.”

<sup>143</sup> “Julia Driver’s *Uneasy Virtue* offers a theory of virtue and the virtues without being an instance of virtue ethics. It presents a consequentialist challenge to recent virtue ethics, but its positive views – and especially its interesting examples – have great significance in their own right. Driver’s defence of ‘virtues of ignorance’ has force despite all the challenges to it that have been mounted over the years. But there are also examples differing from those Driver has mentioned that favour the idea of such virtues. Perhaps certain virtues of religious faith and the virtue necessary for dealing as best one can with moral dilemmas both require ignorance. However, some of the examples Driver does discuss raise the question whether virtue status is based solely on consequences, rather than perhaps having (in addition) a motivational component.”

Howard K. Wettstein, Notre Dame, S. 12–31.

- 1992 [560] Solomon, Robert C. (1992): Corporate Roles, Personal Virtues: An Aristotelian Approach to Business Ethics, in *Virtue Ethics. A Critical Reader*, hrsg. von Daniel Statman, Edinburgh 1997, S. 205–26.
- 1998 [561] Solomon, Robert C. (1998): The Virtues of a Passionate Life: Erotic Love and “the Will to Power”, in *Virtue and Vice*, hrsg. von Ellen Frankel Paul, Fred D. Miller, Jr. und Jeffrey Paul, Cambridge, S. 91–118.
- 2003 [562] Solomon, Robert C. (2003): Victims of Circumstances? A Defense of Virtue Ethics in Business, *Business Ethics Quarterly* 13, S. 43–62. – Dazu: [258].
- 2005 [563] Solomon, Robert C. (2005): Erotic Love as a Moral Virtue, in *Virtue Ethics, Old and New*, hrsg. von Stephen M. Gardiner, Ithaca, S. 81–100.
- 2005 [564] Solomon, Robert C. (2005): “What’s Character Got to Do with It?”, *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 71, S. 648–55. – Zu [181]. Vgl. dazu: [183].
- 2018 [565] Solomon, William David (2018): Early Virtue Ethics, in *The Oxford Handbook of Virtue*, hrsg. von Nancy E. Snow, Oxford, S. 303–20.
- 2009 [566] Sosa, Ernest (2009): Situations Against Virtues: The Situationist Attack on Virtue Theory, in *Philosophy of the Social Sciences: Philosophical Theory and Scientific Practice*, hrsg. von C. Mantzavinos, Cambridge, S. 274–90. – Dazu: Steven Lukes, Comment: Do People Have Character Traits?, S. 291–98.
- 1992 [567] Spohn, William C. (1992): The Return of Virtue Ethics, *Theological Studies* 53, S. 60–75.
- 2002 [568] Sreenivasan, Gopal (2002): Errors about Errors: Virtue Theory and Trait Attribution, *Mind* 111, S. 47–68.<sup>144</sup> – Zu [180], [256]. Vgl. dazu: [682].
- 2008 [569] Sreenivasan, Gopal (2008): Character and Consistency: Still More Errors, *Mind* 117, S. 603–12.<sup>145</sup> – Zu [682].

---

<sup>144</sup> “This paper examines the implications of certain social psychological experiments for moral theory – specifically, for virtue theory. Gilbert Harman and John Doris have recently argued that the empirical evidence offered by ‘situationism’ demonstrates that there is no such thing as a character trait. I dispute this conclusion. My discussion focuses on the proper interpretation of the experimental data – the data themselves I grant for the sake of argument. I develop three criticisms of the anti-trait position. Of these, the central criticism concerns three respects in which the experimental situations employed to test someone’s character trait are inadequate to the task. First, they do not take account of the subject’s own construal of the situation. Second, they include behaviour that is only marginally relevant to the trait in question. Third, they disregard the normative character of the responses in which virtue theory is interested. Given these inadequacies in situationism’s operationalized conception of a ‘character trait’, I argue that situationism does not really address the proposition that people have ‘character traits’, properly understood. A fortiori, the social psychological evidence does not refute that proposition. I also adduce some limited experimental evidence in favour of character traits and distil two lessons we can nevertheless learn from situationism.”

<sup>145</sup> “This paper continues a debate among philosophers concerning the implications of situationist experiments in social psychology for the theory of virtue. In a previous paper (2002), I argued among other things that

- 2009 [570] Sreenivasan, Gopal (2009): Disunity of Virtue, *Journal of Ethics* 13, S. 195–212.<sup>146</sup>
- 2013 [571] Sreenivasan, Gopal (2013): The Situationist Critique of Virtue Ethics, in *Cambridge Companion to Virtue Ethics*, hrsg. von Daniel C. Russell, Cambridge, S. 290–314.
- 2020 [572] Sreenivasan, Gopal (2020): *Emotion and Virtue*, Princeton, NJ.
- 2008 [573] Stangl, Rebecca (2008): A Dilemma for Particularist Virtue Ethics, *Philosophical Quarterly* 58, S. 665–78.<sup>147</sup>
- 2010 [574] Stangl, Rebecca (2010): Asymmetrical Virtue Particularism, *Ethics* 121, S. 37–57.<sup>148</sup>
- 2018 [575] Stangl, Rebecca L. (2018): Cultural Relativity and Justification, in *The Oxford Handbook of Virtue*, hrsg. von Nancy E. Snow, Oxford, S. 508–23.
- 2001 [576] Stark, Susan (2001): Virtue and Emotion, *Nous* 35, S. 440–55.
- 2004 [577] Stark, Susan (2004): A Change of Heart: Moral Emotions, Transformation, and Moral Virtue, *Journal of Moral Philosophy* 1, S. 31–50.<sup>149</sup>

---

the sort of character trait problematized by Hartshorne and May's (1928) famous study of honesty is not the right sort to trouble the theory of virtue. Webber (2006) criticizes my argument, alleging that it founders on an ambiguity in 'cross-situational consistency' and that Milgram's (1974) obedience experiment is immune to the objections I levelled against Hartshorne and May. Here I respond to his criticisms. The most important error in Webber's argument is that it overlooks a distinction between 'one time performance' experiments and 'iterated trial' experiments. I explain why the former cannot begin to trouble the theory of virtue."

<sup>146</sup> "This paper argues against the unity of the virtues, while trying to salvage some of its attractive aspects. I focus on the strongest argument for the unity thesis, which begins from the premise that true virtue cannot lead its possessor morally astray. I suggest that this premise presupposes the possibility of completely insulating an agent's set of virtues from any liability to moral error. I then distinguish three conditions that separately foreclose this possibility, concentrating on the proposition that there is more to morality than virtue alone—that is, not all moral considerations are ones to which some virtue is characteristically sensitive. If the virtues are not unified, the situationist critique of virtue ethics also turns out to be more difficult to establish than some have supposed."

<sup>147</sup> "There is an obvious affinity between virtue ethics and particularism. Both stress the complexity of the moral life, the inadequacy of rule-following as a guide to moral deliberation, and the importance of judgement in discerning the morally relevant features of particular situations. Yet it remains an open question how deep the affinity goes. I argue that the radical form of particularism defended by Jonathan Dancy has surprisingly strong implications for virtue ethics. Adopting such a view would require the virtue theorist either to adopt an unattractive model of moral motivation or to embrace a fairly strong version of the unity of the virtues."

<sup>148</sup> "In this essay, I defend an account of right action that I shall call "asymmetrical virtue particularism." An action, on this account, is right just insofar as it is overall virtuous. But the virtuousness of an action in any particular respect, X, is deontically variant; it can fail to be right-making, either because it is deontically irrelevant or because it is wrong-making. Finally, the account is asymmetrical insofar as the viciousness of actions is not deontically variant; if any action is vicious in some respect Y, then Y is always a wrong-making feature of any action whatever that has Y."

<sup>149</sup> "Inspired in part by a renewed attention to Aristotle's moral philosophy, philosophers have acknowledged the important role of the emotions in morality. Nonetheless, precisely how emotions matter to morality has

- 1995 [578] Statman, Daniel (1995): Virtue Ethics and Psychology, *International Journal of Applied Philosophy* 9, S. 43–50.
- 1997 [579] Statman, Daniel (1997): Introduction to Virtue Ethics, in *Virtue Ethics. A Critical Reader*, hrsg. von Daniel Statman, Edinburgh, S. 1–41.
- 1997 [580] Statman, Daniel (Hrsg.) (1997): *Virtue Ethics. A Critical Reader*, Edinburgh.
- 1998 [581] Stemmer, P./Schönberger, R./Höffe, O./Rapp, Ch. (1998): Tugend, in *Historisches Wörterbuch der Philosophie*, hrsg. von Joachim Ritter und Karlfried Gründer, Basel, Bd. 10, S. 1532–70.
- 2007 [582] Stichter, Matt (2007): Ethical Expertise: The Skill Model of Virtue, *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* 10, S. 183–94.<sup>150</sup>
- 2011 [583] Stichter, Matt (2011): Virtues, Skills, and Right Action, *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* 14, S. 73–86.<sup>151</sup>

---

remained contentious. Aristotelians claim that moral virtue is constituted by correct action and correct emotion. But Kantians seem to require solely that agents do morally correct actions out of respect for the moral law. There is a crucial philosophical disagreement between the Aristotelian and Kantian moral outlooks: namely, is feeling the correct emotions necessary to virtue or is it an optional extra, which is permitted but not required. I argue that there are good reasons for siding with the Aristotelians: virtuous agents must experience the emotions appropriate to their situations. Moral virtue requires a change of heart.”

<sup>150</sup> “Julia Annas is one of the few modern writers on virtue that has attempted to recover the ancient idea that virtues are similar to skills. In doing so, she is arguing for a particular account of virtue, one in which the intellectual structure of virtue is analogous to the intellectual structure of practical skills. The main benefit of this skill model of virtue is that it can ground a plausible account of the moral epistemology of virtue. This benefit, though, is only available to some accounts of virtue. Annas claims that Aristotle rejects this skill model of virtue, and so the model of virtues as a skill that Annas endorses for the modern virtue theory is Socratic. This paper argues that while Aristotle rejects the Socratic model of virtue as a skill, he does not reject the model of virtue as a skill altogether. Annas has mischaracterized Aristotle’s position on the skill model, because she has not recognized that Aristotle endorses a different account of the structure of skill than the one put forth by Socrates. In addition, recent research on expertise provides an account of skills very much at odds with the description of skills offered by Annas, but similar to the account endorsed by Aristotle. Contrary to Annas, not only is the skill model of virtue compatible with a neo-Aristotelian account of virtue, but it also appears that basing a skill model of virtue on a Socratic account of virtue is likely to prove unsuccessful.”

<sup>151</sup> “According to Rosalind Hursthouse’s virtue based account of right action, an act is right if it is what a fully virtuous person would do in that situation. Robert Johnson has criticized the account on the grounds that the actions a non-virtuous person should take are often uncharacteristic of the virtuous person, and thus Hursthouse’s account of right action is too narrow. The non-virtuous need to take steps to improve themselves morally, and the fully virtuous person need not take these steps. So Johnson argues that any virtue based account of right action will have to find a way to ground a moral obligation to improve oneself. This paper argues that there is an account of virtue that can offer a partial solution to Johnson’s challenge, an account where virtue is a type of practical skill and in which the virtuous person is seen as having expertise. The paper references the account of skill acquisition developed by Hubert and Stuart Dreyfus.

- 2018 [584] Stichter, Matt (2018): Virtua as a Skill, in *The Oxford Handbook of Virtue*, hrsg. von Nancy E. Snow, Oxford, S. 57–81.
- 1979 [585] Stocker, Michael (1979): Good Intentions in Greek and Modern Moral Virtue, *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* 57, S. 220–4.
- 1994 [586] Stocker, Michael (1994): Self-Other Asymmetries and Virtue Theory, *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 54, S. 689–94. (Zu M. Slote, *From Morality to Virtue*)
- 1996 [587] Stocker, Michael (1996): How Emotions Reveal Value and Help Cure the Schizophrenia of Modern Ethical Theories, in *How Should One Live? Essays on the Virtues*, hrsg. von Roger Crisp, Oxford, S. 173–90.
- 1997 [588] Stocker, Michael (1997): Emotional Identification, Closeness and Size: Some Contributions to Virtue Ethics, in *Virtue Ethics. A Critical Reader*, hrsg. von Daniel Statman, Edinburgh, S. 118–27.
- 2003 [589] Stohr, Karen E. (2003): Moral Cacophony: When Continence is a Virtue, *Journal of Ethics* 7, S. 339–63.<sup>152</sup>
- 2006 [590] Stohr, Karen E. (2006): Contemporary Virtue Ethics, *Philosophy Compass* 1, S. 22–7.
- 2010 [591] Stohr, Karen E. (2010): Teaching & Learning Guide for: Contemporary Virtue Ethics, *Philosophy Compass* 5, S. 102–7.
- 2018 [592] Stohr, Karen E. (2018): Virtuous Motivation, in *The Oxford Handbook of Virtue*, hrsg. von Nancy E. Snow, Oxford, S. 453–69.
- 2002 [593] Stohr, Karen /Wellman, Christopher Heath (2002): Recent Work on Virtue Ethics, *American Philosophical Quarterly* 39, S. 49–72.

---

Their research demonstrates that novices in a skill have to employ different strategies to act well than the strategies used by the experts, and so the ‘virtue as skill’ thesis provides support for Johnson’s claim that the actions of the non-virtuous will differ from the virtuous. On the other hand, their research suggests that there is no separating the commitment to improve yourself from the possession of expertise, and so the ‘virtue as skill’ thesis has the resources for grounding the obligation to improve oneself in an account of virtue.”

<sup>152</sup> “Contemporary virtue ethicists widely accept the thesis that a virtuous agent’s feelings should be in harmony with her judgments about what she should do and that she should find virtuous action easy and pleasant. Conflict between an agent’s feelings and her actions, by contrast, is thought to indicate mere continence – a moral deficiency. This “harmony thesis” is generally taken to be a fundamental element of Aristotelian virtue ethics. I argue that the harmony thesis, understood this way, is mistaken, because there are occasions where a virtuous agent will find right action painful and difficult. What this means is that the generally accepted distinction between continence and virtue is unsupportable. This conclusion affects several well-known accounts of virtuous action, including those of Philippa Foot and John McDowell. A closer look at Aristotle, however, provides another way of distinguishing between continence and virtue, based in his categorization of goods as noble or base. I argue that virtue is exhibited when an agent’s feelings harmonize with his correct judgments of value, while discrepancies between feelings and correct judgments of value indicate continence. This understanding of continence and virtue enables us to accommodate the problem cases I raise.”

- 2025 [594] Stöpfungeschoff, Alexander (2025): Aquinas on the Enumeration of the Virtues, *The Journal of Ethics* 29, S. 519–32.<sup>153</sup>
- 1992 [595] Strauss, David A. (1992): The Liberal Virtues, in *Virtue (Nomos 34)*, hrsg. von John W. Chapman und William A. Galston, New York, S. 197–203.
- 1998 [596] Sumner, L. W. (1998): Is Virtue Its Own Reward?, in *Virtue and Vice*, hrsg. von Ellen Frankel Paul, Fred D. Miller, Jr. und Jeffrey Paul, Cambridge, S. 18–36.
- 2008 [597] Svensson, Frans (2008): Virtue Ethics and Elitism, *Philosophical Papers* 37, S. 131–155.<sup>154</sup>
- 2010 [598] Svensson, Frans (2010): Virtue Ethics and the Search for an Account of Right Action, *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* 13, S. 255–71.<sup>155</sup>
- 2011 [599] Svensson, Frans (2011): Eudaimonist Virtue Ethics and Right Action: A Reassessment, *Journal of Ethics* 15, S. 321–39.<sup>156</sup>

---

<sup>153</sup> “Daniel Russell has argued that virtue ethics requires a criterion for enumerating the virtues and suggests that reasons for action distinguish them (2009). This paper explores and defends Thomas Aquinas’s (ca. 1225–1274) view that virtues are distinguished by what makes us good in overcoming the difficulties we face. Aquinas’s account explains why agents can seemingly perform different virtuous actions for the same reasons while still satisfying the demands set by Russell for a theory of enumeration.”

<sup>154</sup> “Because of its reliance on a basically Aristotelian conception of virtue, contemporary virtue ethics is often criticised for being inherently elitist. I argue that this objection is mistaken. The core of my argument is that we need to take seriously that virtue, according to Aristotle, is something that we acquire gradually, via a developmental process. People are not just stuck with their characters once and for all, but can always aspire to become better (more virtuous). And that is plausibly the basic normative requirement of virtue ethics.”

<sup>155</sup> “Conceived of as a contender to other theories in substantive ethics, virtue ethics is often associated with, in essence, the following account or criterion of right action: VR: An action A is right for S in circumstances C if and only if a fully virtuous agent would characteristically do A in C. There are serious objections to VR, which take the form of counter-examples. They present us with different scenarios in which less than fully virtuous persons would be acting rightly in doing what no fully virtuous agent would characteristically do in the circumstances. In this paper, various proposals for how to revise VR in order to avoid these counter-examples are considered. I will argue that in so far as the revised accounts really do manage to steer clear of the counter-examples to VR, something which it turns out is not quite true for all of them, they instead fall prey to other damaging objections. I end by discussing the future of virtue ethics, given what has come to light in the previous sections of the paper. In particular, I sketch the outlines of a virtue ethical account of rightness that is structurally different from VR. This account also faces important problems. Still, I suggest that further scrutiny is required before we are in a position to make a definitive decision about its fate.”

<sup>156</sup> “My question in this paper concerns what *eudaimonist virtue ethics* (EVE) might have to say about what *makes* right actions right. This is obviously an important question if we want to know what (if anything) distinguishes EVE from various forms of consequentialism and deontology in ethical theorizing. The answer most commonly given is that according to EVE, an action is right if and only if it is what a virtuous person would do in the circumstances. However, understood as a claim about what makes particular actions right, this is not especially plausible. What makes a virtuous person’s actions right must reasonably be a matter of the feature, or features, which she, via her practical wisdom, appreciates as ethically relevant in the circumstances, and *not* the fact that someone such as herself would perform those actions. I argue that EVE

- 1993 [600] Swanton, Christine (1993): Commentary on Michael Slote's "Virtue Ethics and Democratic Value", *Journal of Social Philosophy* 24, S. 38–49.
- 1993 [601] Swanton, Christine (1993): Satisficing and Virtue, *Journal of Philosophy* 90, S. 33–48.
- 1995 [602] Swanton, Christine (1995): Profiles of the Virtues, *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* 76, S. 47–72.
- 1996 [603] Swanton, Christine (1996): Virtue Ethics and the Problem of Indirection: A Pluralistic Value-Centred Approach, *Utilitas* 9, S. 167–81.<sup>157</sup>
- 1997 [604] Swanton, Christine (1997): Virtue Ethics and Satisficing Rationality, *Virtue Ethics. A Critical Reader*, hrsg. von Daniel Statman, Edinburgh 1997, S. 82–98. (Revidierte Version von "Satisficing and Virtue" (1993))
- 1997 [605] Swanton, Christine (1997): The Supposed Tension Between 'Strength' and 'Gentleness' Conceptions of the Virtues, *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* 75, S. 497–510.
- 1997 [606] Swanton, Christine (1997): Virtue Ethics and the Problem of Indirection: A Pluralistic Value-Centered Approach, *Utilitas* 9, S. 167–81.
- 2001 [607] Swanton, Christine (2001): A Virtue Ethical Account of Right Action, *Ethics* 112, S. 32–52.
- 2001 [608] Swanton, Christine (2001): Virtue Ethics, Value-centredness, and Consequentialism, *Utilitas* 13, S. 213–35.
- 2003 [609] Swanton, Christine (2003): *Virtue Ethics. A Pluralistic View*, Oxford.
- 2004 [610] Swanton, Christine (2004): Satisficing and Perfectionism in Virtue Ethics, in *Satisficing and Maximizing: Moral Theorists on Practical Reason*, hrsg. von Michael Byron, Cambridge, S. 176–89.

---

instead should be understood as a more radical alternative in ethical philosophy, an alternative that relies on the background assumption that no general account or criterion for what makes right actions right is available to us: right action is simply too complex to be captured in a 'finite and manageable set of...moral principles' (McKeever and Ridge, *Principled ethics*, Oxford University Press, 2006, p. 139). This does not rule out the possibility that there might be *some* generalizations about how we should act which hold true without exception. Perhaps there are some things which we must never do, as well as some features of the world which always carry normative weight (even though their exact weight may vary from one context to another). Still, these things are arguably few and far between, and what we must do to ensure that we reliably recognize what is right in particular situations is to acquire practical wisdom. Nothing short of that could do the job."

<sup>157</sup> "Many forms of virtue ethics, like certain forms of utilitarianism, suffer from the problem of indirection. In those forms, the criterion for status of a trait as a virtue is not the same as the criterion for the status of an act as right. Furthermore, if the virtues for example are meant to promote the flourishing of the agent, the virtuous agent is not standardly supposed to be motivated by concern for her own flourishing in her activity. In this paper, I propose a virtue ethics which does not suffer from the problem. Traits are not virtues because their cultivation and manifestation promote a value such as agent flourishing. They are virtues in so far as they are habits of appropriate response (which may be of various types) to various relevant values (valuable things, etc.). This means that there is a direct connection between the rationale of a virtue and what makes an action virtuous or right."

- 2005 [611] Swanton, Christine (2005): Nietzschean Virtue Ethics, in *Virtue Ethics, Old and New*, hrsg. von Stephen M. Gardiner, Ithaca, S. 179–92.
- 2010 [612] Swanton, Christine (2010): A Challenge to Intellectual Virtue from Moral Virtue: The Case of Universal Love, *Metaphilosophy* 41, S. 152–71.<sup>158</sup>
- 2013 [613] Swanton, Christine (2013): The Definition of Virtue Ethics, in *Cambridge Companion to Virtue Ethics*, hrsg. von Daniel C. Russell, Cambridge, S. 315–38.
- 2013 [614] Swanton, Christine (2013): Practical Virtue Ethics, in *The International Encyclopedia of Ethics*, hrsg. von Hugh LaFollette, Chichester, S. 4000–4009.
- 2015 [615] Swanton, Christine (2015): Cultivating Virtue: Two Problems for Virtue Ethics, in *Cultivating Virtue. Perspectives from Philosophy, Theology, and Psychology*, hrsg. von Nancy E. Snow, Oxford, S. 111–34.
- 2015 [616] Swanton, Christine (2015): *The Virtue Ethics of Hume and Nietzsche*, Chichester.<sup>159</sup>

---

<sup>158</sup> “On the Aristotelian picture of virtue, moral virtue has at its core intellectual virtue. An interesting challenge for this orthodoxy is provided by the case of universal love and its associated virtues, such as the dispositions to exhibit grace, or to forgive, where appropriate. It is difficult to find a property in the object of such love, in virtue of which grace, for example, ought to be bestowed. Perhaps, then, love in general, including universal love, is not necessarily exhibited for reasons. This is the view that, with the help of Heidegger’s notion of a fundamental emotional attunement (*Grundstimmung*), I defend. The problem is to show how universal love, and its manifestation in the virtues of universal love, can then be seen as rational. Showing this is the task of the essay.”

<sup>159</sup> Preface ix Introduction xi Part I: A Virtue Ethical Map 1 Chapter 1 Interpretation as a Map 3 Chapter 2 Hume and Nietzsche as Response Dependence Virtue Ethicists 19 Part II: The Virtue Ethics of Hume 43 Chapter 3 Can Hume Be Both a Sentimentalist and a Virtue Ethicist? 45 Chapter 4 Hume and the Problem of Justice as a Virtue 70 Chapter 5 What Kind of Virtue Ethicist Is Hume? 87 Part III: The Virtue Ethics of Nietzsche 109 Chapter 6 Can Nietzsche Be Both a Virtue Ethicist and an Egoist? 111 Chapter 7 Can Nietzsche Be Both a Virtue Ethicist and an Existentialist? 135 Chapter 8 What Kind of Virtue Ethicist Is Nietzsche? 157 Part IV: New Directions 179 Chapter 9 Humean Virtue Ethics: Virtue Ethics of Love 181 Chapter 10 Nietzschean Virtue Ethics: Virtue Ethics of Becoming 195 Bibliography 212 Index 222.

- 2021 [617] Swanton, Christine (2021): *Target Centred Virtue Ethics*, Oxford.<sup>160</sup>
- 2010 [618] Szalek, Piotr (2010): Does Virtue Ethics Really Exclude Duty Ethics?, *International Philosophical Quarterly* 50, S. 351–61.
- 2001 [619] Tännsjö, Torbjörn (2001): Virtue Ethics, in *Exploring Practical Philosophy: From Action to Values*, hrsg. von Dan Egonsson, Jonas Josefsson, Björn Petersson und Toni Rönnow-Rasmussen, Aldershot, S. 167–85.
- 2002 [620] Tännsjö, Torbjörn (2002): *Understanding Ethics. An Introduction to Moral Theory*, Edinburgh, S. 91–105 (“Virtue Ethics”).
- 1988 [621] Taylor, Gabriele (1988): Envy and Jealousy: Emotions and Vices, in *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* Vol. XIII: *Ethical Theory: Character and Virtue*, hrsg. von Peter A. French, Theodore E. Uehling, Jr. und Howard K. Wettstein, Notre Dame, S. 233–49.
- 1996 [622] Taylor, Gabriele (1996): Deadly Vices?, in *How Should One Live? Essays on the Virtues*, hrsg. von Roger Crisp, Oxford, S. 157–72.
- 1968 [623] Taylor, Gabriele/Wolfram, Sybil (1968): The Self-Regarding and Other-Regarding Virtues, *Philosophical Quarterly* 18, S. 238–50.
- 1971 [624] Taylor, Gabriele/Wolfram, Sybil (1971): Virtues and Passions, *Analysis*, S. 76–83.
- 1988 [625] Taylor, Richard (1988): Ancient Wisdom and Modern Folly, in *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* Vol. XIII: *Ethical Theory: Character and Virtue*, hrsg. von Peter A. French, Theodore E. Uehling, Jr. und Howard K. Wettstein, Notre Dame, S. 54–63.
- 1994 [626] Terzis, George N. (1994): Human Flourishings: A Psychological Critique of Virtue Ethics, *American Philosophical Quarterly* 31, S. 333–342.
- 2005 [627] Tessman, Lisa (2005): *Burdened Virtues. Virtue Ethics for Liberatory Struggles*, Oxford.<sup>161</sup> – Vgl. dazu (aus dem “Symposium on Lisa Tessman’s *Burdened Virtues*” in *Hypatia* 23 (2008), S. 182–216): [118], [220], [335].

---

<sup>160</sup> “Virtue ethics in its contemporary manifestation is dominated by neo Aristotelian virtue ethics primarily developed by Rosalind Hursthouse. This version of eudaimonistic virtue ethics was ground breaking, but has been subject to considerable critical attention. Christine Swanton shows that the time is ripe for new developments and alternatives. The target centred virtue ethics proposed by Swanton is opposed to orthodox virtue ethics in two major ways. First, it rejects the ‘natural goodness’ metaphysics of Neo Aristotelian virtue ethics owed to Philippa Foot in favour of a ‘hermeneutic ontology’ of ethics inspired by the Continental tradition and McDowell. Second, it rejects the well -known ‘qualified agent’ account of right action made famous by Hursthouse in favour of a target centred framework for assessing rightness of acts. Swanton develops the target centred view with discussions of Dancy’s particularism, default reasons and thick concepts, codifiability, and its relation to the Doctrine of the mean.

*Target Centred Virtue Ethics* retains the pluralism of *Virtue Ethics: A Pluralistic View* (2003) but develops it further in relation to a pluralistic account of practical reason. This study develops other substantive positions including the view that target centred virtue ethics is developmental, suitably embedded in an environmental ethics of “dwelling”; and incorporates a concept of differentiated virtue to allow for roles, narrativity, cultural and historical location, and stage of life.”

- 2008 [628] Tessman, Lisa (2008): Reply to Critics, *Hypatia* 23, S. 205–16.<sup>162</sup> – Zu [118], [220], [335].
- 2013 [629] Tessman, Lisa (2013): Virtue Ethics and Moral Failure: Lessons from Neuroscientific Moral Psychology, in *Virtues in Action. New Essays in Applied Virtue Ethics*, hrsg. von Michael W. Austin, Houndmills, Basingstoke, S. 171–89.
- 2015 [630] Thompson, Ross A. (2015): The Development of Virtue. A Perspective from Developmental Psychology, in *Cultivating Virtue. Perspectives from Philosophy, Theology, and Psychology*, hrsg. von Nancy E. Snow, Oxford, S. 279–306.
- 2006 [631] Tiberius, Valerie (2006): How to Think About Virtue and Right, *Philosophical Papers* 35, S. 247–265.<sup>163</sup> – Zu [317].
- 1994 [632] Tierney, Nathan L. (1994): *Imagination and Ethical Ideals. Prospects for Unified Philosophical and*

---

<sup>161</sup> Contents: Introduction: Moral Trouble (3) – 1. Regretting the Self One Is (11) – 2. The Damage of Moral Damage (33) – 3. The Ordinary Vices of Domination (53) – 4. Between Indifference and Anguish (81) – 5. The Burden of Political Resistance (107) – 6. Dangerous Loyalties (133) – Conclusion: Eudaimonistic Virtue Ethics under Adversity (159) – Works Cited (169) – Index (179).

Description: “Lisa Tessman’s *Burdened Virtues* is a deeply original and provocative work that engages questions central to feminist theory and practice, from the perspective of Aristotelian ethics. Focused primarily on selves who endure and resist oppression, she addresses the ways in which devastating conditions confronted by these selves both limit and burden their moral goodness, and affect their possibilities of flourishing. She describes two different forms of “moral trouble” prevalent under oppression. The first is that the oppressed self may be morally damaged, prevented from developing or exercising some of the virtues; the second is that the very conditions of oppression require the oppressed to develop a set of virtues that carry a moral cost to those who practice them – traits that Tessman refers to as “burdened virtues.” These virtues have the unusual feature of being disjoined from their bearer’s own well being.

Tessman’s work focuses on issues that have been missed by many feminist moral theories, and her use of the virtue ethics framework brings feminist concerns more closely into contact with mainstream ethical theory. This book will appeal to feminist theorists in philosophy and women’s studies, but also more broadly, ethicists and social theorists.”

<sup>162</sup> “Tessman responds to her three critics’ comments on *Burdened Virtues*, focusing on their concerns with her stipulation of an “inclusivity requirement,” according to which one cannot be said to flourish without contributing to the flourishing of an inclusive collectivity. Tessman identifies a naturalized approach to ethics – which she distinguishes from the naturalism she implicitly endorsed in *Burdened Virtues* – that illuminates how a conception of flourishing that meets the inclusivity requirement could carry moral authority.”

<sup>163</sup> “Robert Johnson argues that virtue ethical accounts of right action fail because they cannot take account of the fact that there are things we ought to do precisely because we do not possess virtuous character traits. Self-improving actions are his paradigm case and it would indeed be a problem if virtue ethics could not make sense of the propriety of self-improvement. To solve this serious problem, I propose that virtue ethics ought to define right action in terms of the virtuous agent’s reasons for action instead of defining right action in terms of the actions that the virtuous agent performs. I argue that this revised definition of right action makes sense of the Tightness of self-improving actions and that it can be given a genuinely virtue ethical interpretation.”

*Psychological Understanding*, Albany, S. 129–35 (“Virtue Ethics Reconsidered”).

- 2020 [633] Timmermann, Travis/Cohen, Yishai (2020): The Limits of Virtue Ethics, in *Oxford Studies in Normative Ethics* 10, hrsg. von Mark Timmons, Oxford, S. 255–82.
- 2002 [634] Timmons, Mark (2002): *Moral Theory. An Introduction*, Lanham, S. 211–43 (“Virtue Ethics”).
- 2006 [635] Toner, Christopher (2006): The Self-Centredness Objection to Virtue Ethics, *Philosophy* 81, S. 595–618.<sup>164</sup>
- 2010 [636] Toner, Christopher (2010): Virtue Ethics and the Nature and Forms of Egoism, *Journal of Philosophical Research* 35.
- 2014 Toner, Christopher (2014): The Full Unity of the Virtues, *Journal of Ethics* 18, S.
- 2011 [637] Trampota, Andreas (2011): Tugend als Wahrnehmungspotenzial. Der Begriff der ethischen Wahrnehmung in tugendethischen Konzeptionen, in *Wirklichkeit und Wahrnehmung des Heiligen, Schönen, Guten. Neue Beiträge zur Realismusdebatte*, hrsg. von Elisabeth Heinrich und Dieter Schönecker, Paderborn, S. 303–322.
- 1986 [638] Trianosky, Gregory (1986): Supererogation, Wrongdoing, and Vice: On the Autonomy of the Ethics of Virtue, *Journal of Philosophy* 83, S. 26–40. Wiederabgedruckt in *Ethical Theory*, hrsg. von James Rachels, Oxford 1998, S. 454–69.
- 1988 [639] Trianosky, Gregory (1988): Virtue, Action and the Good Life: A Theory of the Virtues, *Pacific Journal of Philosophy*.
- 1990 [640] Trianosky, Gregory (1990): What is Virtue Ethics All About?, *American Philosophical Quarterly* 27, S. 335–44. Wiederabgedruckt in *Virtue Ethics. A Critical Reader*, hrsg. von Daniel Statman, Edinburgh 1997, S. 42–55.
- 1990 [641] Trianosky, Gregory (1990): Natural Affection and Responsibility for Character: A Critique of Kantian Views of the Virtues, in *Identity, Character, and Morality. Essays in Moral Psychology*, hrsg. von Owen Flanagan und Amélie Oksenberg Rorty, Cambridge, Mass., S. 93–109.
- 2013 [642] Trivigno, Franco V. (2013): A Virtue Ethical Case for Pacifism, in *Virtues in Action. New Essays in Applied Virtue Ethics*, hrsg. von Michael W. Austin, Houndmills, Basingstoke, S. 86–101.
- 1993 [643] Tugendhat, Ernst (1993): *Vorlesungen über Ethik*, Frankfurt a. M., S. 227–38 („Tugenden“).
- 2021 [644] Um, Sungwoo (2021): What is a Relational Virtue, *Philosophical Studies* 178, S. 95–111.<sup>165</sup>

---

<sup>164</sup> “Aristotelian virtue ethics is often charged with counseling a self-centred approach to the moral life. Reviewing some influential responses made by defenders of virtue ethics, I argue that none of them goes far enough. I begin my own response by evaluating two common targets of the objection, Aristotle and Aquinas, and based on my findings sketch the outlines of a clearly non-self-centred version of virtue ethics, according to which the ‘center’ is instead located in the agent’s right relation to others and ultimately to the Good. I conclude that while some species of virtue ethics may be self-centred, the objection cannot be used to indict the whole genus.”

<sup>165</sup> “In this paper, I introduce what I call relational virtue and defend it as an important subcategory of virtue. In particular, I argue that it offers a valuable resource for answering questions concerning the value of intimate relationships such as parent–child relationship or friendship. After briefly sketching what I mean by

- 2008 [645] Upton, Candace L. (2008): Virtue Ethics, Character, and Normative Receptivity, *Journal of Moral Philosophy* 5, S. 77–95.<sup>166</sup>
- 2009 [646] Upton, Candace L. (2009): The Structure of Character, *Journal of Ethics* 13, S. 175–93.<sup>167</sup>
- 2009 [647] Upton, Candace L. (2009): Virtue Ethics and Moral Psychology: The Situationism Debate, *Journal of Ethics* 13, S. 103–15.
- 2016 [648] Upton, Candace L. (2016): The Empirical Argument Against Virtue, *Journal of Ethics* 20, S. 355–71.<sup>168</sup>

---

relational virtue, I show why it is a virtue and in what sense we can meaningfully distinguish it from other sorts of virtue. I then describe some distinctive features of relational virtue in more detail and discuss their implications. Next, I present filial piety as the paradigmatic example of relational virtue. I argue that a child's being filial should be understood as an appropriate response to her parent's being virtuous as a parent. I conclude by showing how my relational virtue theory of filial piety can avoid the difficulties faced by previous theories of filial piety such as gratitude theory and friendship theory."

<sup>166</sup> "Classically-conceived accounts of character posit traits that are both dynamic and global. Dynamic traits produce behavior, and global traits produce behavior across the full range of situation kinds relevant to a particular trait. If you are classically just, for example, you would behave justly across the full range of situation kinds relevant to justice. But classical traits are too crude to fulfill trait attributions' intrinsically normative purpose, which is to reflect the moral merit agents deserve. I defend an extra-classical account of character traits that endorses flexible traits that might issue in behavior across any narrow or broad range of situation kinds, and static traits that might issue in no behavior at all. Extra-classical traits are more subtle and sensitive, and so are normatively receptive to the credit that psychologically-complicated agents merit. Further, extra-classical traits can fulfill all the unproblematic roles of classical traits. Extra-classicism is, hence, a significant and substantial improvement upon classically conceived character traits and traditional virtue ethics."

<sup>167</sup> "In this paper, I defend a local account of character traits that posits traits like close-friend-honesty and good-mood-compassion. John Doris also defends local character traits, but his local character traits are indistinguishable from mere behavioral dispositions, they are not necessary for the purpose which allegedly justifies them, and their justification is only contingent, depending upon the prevailing empirical situation. The account of local traits I defend posits local traits that are traits of character rather than behavioral dispositions, local traits that are necessary to satisfy one of their central purposes, and local traits whose justification is dependent upon theoretical rather than empirical considerations."

<sup>168</sup> "The virtues are under fire. Several decades' worth of social psychological findings establish a correlation between human behavior and the situation moral agents inhabit, from which a cadre of moral philosophers concludes that most moral agents lack the virtues. Mark Alfano and Christian Miller introduce novel versions of this argument, but they are subject to a fatal dilemma. Alfano and Miller wrongly assume that their requirements for virtue apply universally to moral agents, who vary radically in their psychological, physiological, and personal situations; I call this the 'content problem.' More troubling, however, the content problem leads to what I call the 'structural problem:' Alfano and Miller each structure their argument against the virtues as a modus tollens argument and, owing to the breadth of the content problem, each must constrain their argument with a ceteris paribus clause. But the ceteris paribus clause precludes each argument's validity. More important, however, the resulting conception of virtue implicitly endorsed by Alfano and Miller holds that virtues are idealized models; but since idealized models do not even purport accurately to describe (much of) the world, neither novel version of EAV gains any empirical

- 2016 [649] Vallor, Shannon (2016): *Technology and the Virtues. A Philosophical Guide to a Future Worth Wanting*, Oxford.
- 2006 [650] van Hooft, Stan (2006): *Understanding Virtue Ethics*, Chesham.
- 2013 [651] van Hooft, Stan (2013): Sex, Temperance, and Virtue, in *Virtues in Action. New Essays in Applied Virtue Ethics*, hrsg. von Michael W. Austin, Houndmills, Basingstoke, S. 55–69.
- 2013 [652] Van Slyke, James A./Peterson, Gregory R./Reimer, Kevin S./Spezio, Michael L./Brown, Warren S. (Hrsg.) (2013): *Theology and the Science of Moral Action. Virtue Ethics, Exemplarity, and Cognitive Neuroscience*, New York, Milton Park, Abingdon.
- 2000 [653] van Zyl, Liezl (2000): *Death and Compassion: A Virtue-Based Approach to Euthanasia*, Aldershot.
- 2002 [654] van Zyl, Liezl (2002): Virtue Theory and Applied Ethics, *South African Journal of Philosophy* 21, S. 133–44.
- 2004 [655] Van Zyl, Liezl (2004): Virtuous Motives, Moral Luck, and Assisted Death, *South African Journal of Philosophy* 23, S. 20–33.<sup>169</sup>
- 2005 [656] Van Zyl, Liezl (2005): In Defence of Agent-Based Virtue Ethics, *Philosophical Papers* 34, S. 273–88.<sup>170</sup>
- 2009 [657] van Zyl, Liezl (2009): Accidental Rightness, *Philosophia* 37, S. 91–104.<sup>171</sup>

---

traction against the virtues. The upshot is an old story whose moral has yet, within the empirical study of the virtues, adequately to be internalized: it is imperative that the empirical observation of character traits proceed via longitudinal studies.”

<sup>169</sup> “In this paper I outline a motive-based virtue account of right action, according to which an action is right if it expresses or exhibits virtuous motive, and which defines virtue in terms of human flourishing. I indicate how this account allows us to deal with the problem of consequential luck. By applying this account to the question of whether it is ever morally right or acceptable to assist in someone's death, I demonstrate how it also allows us to deal with the problem of circumstantial luck, which arises when an agent finds himself in a situation where he is forced to choose between two reprehensible acts.”

<sup>170</sup> “In ‘Against Agent-Based Virtue Ethics’ (2004) Michael Brady rejects agent-based virtue ethics on the grounds that it fails to capture the commonsense distinction between an agent's doing the right thing, and her doing it for the right reason. In his view, the failure to account for this distinction has paradoxical results, making it unable to explain why an agent has a duty to perform a given action. I argue that Brady's objection relies on the assumption that an agent-based account is committed to defining obligations in terms of actual motives. If we reject this view, and instead provide a version of agent-basing that determines obligations in terms of the motives of the hypothetical virtuous agent, the paradox disappears.”

<sup>171</sup> “In this paper I argue that the disagreement between modern moral philosophers and (some) virtue ethicists about whether motive affects rightness is a result of conceptual disagreement, and that when they develop a theory of ‘right action,’ the two parties respond to two very different questions. Whereas virtue ethicists tend to use ‘right’ as interchangeable with ‘good’ or ‘virtuous’ and as implying moral praise, modern moral philosophers use it as roughly equivalent to ‘in accordance with moral obligation.’ One implication of this is that the possibility of an act being right by accident does not pose a problem for consequentialism or deontology. A further implication is that it reveals a shortcoming in virtue ethics, namely that it does not – yet needs to – present an account of moral obligation.”

- 2009 [658] van Zyl, Liezl (2009): Agent-based Virtue Ethics and the Problem of Action Guidance, *Journal of Moral Philosophy* 6, S. 50–69.<sup>172</sup>
- 2011 [659] van Zyl, Liezl (2011): Qualified-agent Virtue Ethics, *South African Journal of Philosophy* 30, S. 219–28.<sup>173</sup>
- 2011 [660] van Zyl, Liezl (2011): Right Action and the Non-Virtuous Agent, *Journal of Applied Philosophy* 28, S. 80–92.<sup>174</sup>
- 2013 [661] van Zyl, Liezl (2013): Virtue Ethics and Right Action, in *Cambridge Companion to Virtue Ethics*, hrsg. von Daniel C. Russell, Cambridge, S. 172–96.
- 2019 [662] van Zyl, Liezl (2019): *Virtue Ethics. A Contemporary Introduction*, New York, Abingdon.<sup>175</sup>
- 1985 [663] Veatch, Robert M. (1985): Against Virtue: A Deontological Critique of Virtue Theory in Medical Ethics, in *Virtue and Medicine: Explorations in the Character of Medicine*, hrsg. von Earl Shelp, Dordrecht, S. 329–45.
- 2010 [664] Verbeek, Bruno (2010): Rational Choice Virtues, *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* 13, S. 541–

---

<sup>172</sup> “Agent-based accounts of virtue ethics, such as the one provided by Michael Slote, base the rightness of action in the motive from which it proceeds. A frequent objection to agent-basing is that it does not allow us to draw the commonsense distinction between doing the right thing and doing it for the right reasons, that is, between act-evaluation and agent-appraisal. I defend agent-basing against this objection, but argue that a more fundamental problem for this account is its apparent failure to provide adequate argue action guidance. I then show that this problem can be solved by supplementing an agent-based criterion of right action with a hypothetical-agent criterion of action guidance.”

<sup>173</sup> “Qualified-agent virtue ethics provides an account of right action in terms of the virtuous agent. It has become one of the most popular, but also most frequently criticized versions of virtue ethics. Many of the objections rest on the mistaken assumption that proponents of qualified-agent virtue ethics share the same view when it comes to fundamental questions about the meaning of the term ‘right action’ and the function of an account of right action. My aim in this paper is not to defend qualified-agent virtue ethics but to correct this misunderstanding, and this will hopefully leave us in a better position to evaluate it.”

<sup>174</sup> “According to qualified-agent virtue ethics, an action is right if and only if it is what a virtuous agent would characteristically do in the circumstances. I discuss two closely related objections to this view, both of which concern the actions of the non-virtuous. The first is that this criterion sometimes gives the wrong result, for in some cases a non-virtuous agent should not do what a virtuous person would characteristically do. A second objection is it altogether fails to apply whenever the agent, through previous wrongdoing, finds herself in circumstances that a virtuous person cannot be in. I focus on Rosalind Hursthouse’s account of right action, and argue that it can provide a satisfactory response to both these objections. I do so by drawing attention to the distinction between action guidance and action assessment, and arguing that while the above criterion is adequate as a means of action assessment, we should turn to the virtue- and vice-rules (v-rules) for action guidance.”

<sup>175</sup> Preface; Acknowledgements; Plan of the Book; 1. Virtue Ethics 2. Virtue 3. Virtue and Happiness 4. Virtuous Motives 5. Practical Wisdom 6. Virtue and Right Action 7. Applying Virtue Ethics 8. Virtue-ethical Particularism 9. The Situationist Critique 10. Virtue and Environmental Ethics; Bibliography; Index

- 2013 [665] Vogler, Candace (2013): Aristotle, Aquinas, Anscombe, and the New Virtue Ethics, in *Aquinas and the Nicomachean Ethics*, hrsg. von Tobias Hoffmann, Jörn Müller und Matthias Perkams, Cambridge, S. 239–57.
- 1984 [666] Vorobej, Mark (1984): Relative Virtue, *Southern Journal of Philosophy* 22, S. 535–41. (Zu Michael Slote, *Goods and Virtues*)
- 2004 [667] Vranas, Peter B. M. (2004): Review of *Lack of Character* by John Doris, *Philosophical Review* 113, S. 284–88. – Zu [181].
- 2009 [668] Vranas, Peter B. M. (2009): Against Moral Character Evaluations: The Undetectability of Virtue and Vice, *Journal of Ethics* 13, S. 213–33.<sup>177</sup>
- 1988 [669] Waide, John (1988): Virtues and Principles, *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 48, S. 455–72.
- 1989 [670] Walker, A. D. M. (1989): Virtue and Character, *Philosophy* 64, S. 349–62.
- 1993 [671] Walker, A. D. M. (1993): The Incompatibility of the Virtues, *Ratio (New Series)* 6, S. 44–62.
- 2007 [672] Walker, Rebecca L./Ivanhoe, Philip J. (Hrsg.) (2007): *Working Virtue. Virtue Ethics and Contemporary Moral Problems*, Oxford 2007.<sup>178</sup>

---

<sup>176</sup> “In this essay, I review some results that suggest that rational choice theory has interesting things to say about the virtues. In particular, I argue that rational choice theory can show, first, the role of certain virtues in a game-theoretic analysis of norms. Secondly, that it is useful in the characterization of these virtues. Finally, I discuss how rational choice theory can be brought to bear upon the justification of these virtues by showing how they contribute to a flourishing life. I do this by discussing one particular example of a norm - the requirement that agents to honor their promises of mutual assistance - and one particular virtue, trustworthiness.”

<sup>177</sup> “I defend the epistemic thesis that evaluations of people in terms of their moral character as good, bad, or intermediate are almost always epistemically unjustified. (1) Because most people are fragmented (they would behave deplorably in many and admirably in many other situations), one’s prior probability that any given person is fragmented should be high. (2) Because one’s information about specific people does not reliably distinguish those who are fragmented from those who are not, one’s posterior probability that any given person is fragmented should be close to one’s prior – and thus should also be high. (3) Because being fragmented entails being indeterminate (neither good nor bad nor intermediate), one’s posterior probability that any given person is indeterminate should also be high – and the epistemic thesis follows. (1) and (3) rely on previous work; here I support (2) by using a mathematical result together with empirical evidence from personality psychology.”

<sup>178</sup> Contents: 1. Introduction , Rebecca L. Walker and Philip J. Ivanhoe 2. Caring as Relation and Virtue in Teaching, Nel Noddings 3. Professing Medicine, Virtue Based Ethics and the Retrieval of Professionalism, Edmund D. Pellegrino 4. Doctoring and Self-Forgiveness, Jeffrey Blustein 5. Virtue Ethics as Professional Ethics: The Case of Psychiatry, Jennifer Radden 6. Trust, Suffering, and the Aesculapian Virtues, Annette C. Baier 7. Environmental Virtue Ethics, Rosalind Hursthouse 8. The Good Life for Nonhuman Animals: What Virtue Requires of Humans, Rebecca L. Walker 9. Law, Morality, and Virtue, Peter Koller 10. Virtue Ethics, Role Ethics, and Business Ethics, Christine Swanton 11. Racial Virtues, Lawrence Blum 12. Virtue and a

- 1978 [673] Wallace, James D. (1978): *Virtues and Vices*, Ithaca.
- 1988 [674] Wallace, James D. (1988): Ethics and the Craft Analogy, in *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* Vol. XIII: *Ethical Theory: Character and Virtue*, hrsg. von Peter A. French, Theodore E. Uehling, Jr. und Howard K. Wettstein, Notre Dame, S. 222–32.
- 1991 [675] Wallace, R. Jay (1991): Virtue, Reason, and Principle, *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 21, S. 469–95.
- 2000 [676] Wallroth, Martin (2000): *Moral ohne Reife? Ein Plädoyer für ein tugendethisches Moralverständnis*, Freiburg, München.
- 2016 [677] Waring, Duff R. (2016): *The Healing Virtues. Character Ethics in Psychotherapy*, Oxford.
- 1971 [678] Warnock, G. J. (1971): *The Object of Morality*, London, S. 71–93 (“Moral Virtues”).
- 1984 [679] Watson, Gary (1984): Virtues in Excess, *Philosophical Studies* 46, S. 57–74.
- 1990 [680] Watson, Gary (1990): On the Primacy of Character, in *Identity, Character, and Morality. Essays in Moral Psychology*, hrsg. von Owen Flanagan und Amélie Oksenberg Rorty, Cambridge, Mass., S. 449–69. Wiederabgedruckt in *Virtue Ethics. A Critical Reader*, hrsg. von Daniel Statman, Edinburgh 1997, S. 56–81.
- 2006 [681] Weaver, Gary R. (2006): Virtue in Organizations: Moral Identity as a Foundation for Moral Agency, *Organization Studies* 27, S. 341–368.<sup>179</sup>
- 2006 [682] Webber, Jonathan (2006): Character, Consistency, and Classification, *Mind* 115, S. 651–58.<sup>180</sup> – Zu [568]. Dazu: [569].
- 2006 [683] Webber, Jonathan (2006): Virtue, Character and Situation, *Journal of Moral Philosophy* 3, S.

---

Warrior’s Anger, Nancy Sherman 13. Famine, Affluence and Virtue, Michael Slote 14. Filial Piety as a Virtue, Philip J. Ivanhoe.

<sup>179</sup> “Framing issues of organizational ethics in terms of virtues and moral agency (rather than in terms of rules and ethical behavior) has implications for the way social science addresses matters of morality in organizations. In particular, attending to matters of virtue and moral agency directs attention to the moral identity, or self-concept, of persons, and to the circumstances that influence self-identity. This article develops parallels between philosophical theories of virtue and the concept of moral identity as developed in social cognitive identity theory. Explicating notions of virtue and moral agency in terms of social cognitive identity theory, in turn, helps direct attention to a range of factors – including both organizational and extraorganizational, macro-cultural ones – that can foster or inhibit moral agency in organizations.”

<sup>180</sup> “John Doris has recently argued that since we do not possess character traits as traditionally conceived, virtue ethics is rooted in a false empirical presupposition. Gopal Sreenivasan has claimed, in a paper in *Mind*, that Doris has not provided suitable evidence for his empirical claim. But the experiment Sreenivasan focuses on is not one that Doris employs, and neither is it relevantly similar in structure. The confusion arises because both authors use the phrase ‘cross-situational consistency’ to describe the aspect of character traits that they are concerned with, but neither defines this phrase, and it is ambiguous: Doris uses it in one sense, Sreenivasan in another. Partly for this reason, the objections Sreenivasan raises fail to block the argument Doris provides. In particular, the most reliable data Doris employs, Milgram’s famous study of authority, is entirely immune to Sreenivasan’s objections. Sreenivasan has not shown, therefore, that Doris provides unsuitable evidence for his claim.”

193–213.<sup>181</sup> – Zu [181].

- 2007 [684] Webber, Jonathan (2007): Character, Common-Sense, and Expertise, *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* 10, S. 89–104.<sup>182</sup>
- 2007 [685] Webber, Jonathan (2007): Character, Global and Local, *Utilitas* 19, S. 430–34.<sup>183</sup>
- 2002 [686] Weber, Verena (2002): *Tugendethik und Kommunitarismus. Individualität, Universalisierung, Moralische Dilemmata*, Würzburg.<sup>184</sup>

---

<sup>181</sup> “Philosophers have recently argued that traditional discussions of virtue and character presuppose an account of behaviour that experimental psychology has shown to be false. Behaviour does not issue from global traits such as prudence, temperance, courage or fairness, they claim, but from local traits such as sailing-in-rough-weather-with-friends-courage and office-party-temperance. The data employed provides evidence for this view only if we understand it in the light of a behaviourist construal of traits in terms of stimulus and response, rather than in the light of the more traditional construal in terms of inner events such as inclinations. More recent experiments have shown this traditional conception to have greater explanatory and predictive power than its behaviourist rival. So we should retain the traditional conception, and hence reject the proposed alteration to our understanding of behaviour. This discussion has further implications for future philosophical investigations of character and virtue.”

<sup>182</sup> “Gilbert Harman has argued that the common-sense characterological psychology employed in virtue ethics is rooted not in unbiased observation of close acquaintances, but rather in the ‘fundamental attribution error’. If this is right, then philosophers cannot rely on their intuitions for insight into characterological psychology, and it might even be that there is no such thing as character. This supports the idea, urged by John Doris and Stephen Stich, that we should rely exclusively on experimental psychology for our explanations of behaviour. The purported ‘fundamental attribution error’ cannot play the explanatory role required of it, however, and anyway there is no experimental evidence that we make such an error. It is true that trait-attribution often goes wrong, but this is best explained by a set of difficulties that beset the explanation of other people’s behaviour, difficulties that become less acute the better we know the agent. This explanation allows that we can gain genuine insight into character on the basis of our intuitions, though claims about the actual distribution of particular traits and the correlations between them must be based on more objective data.”

<sup>183</sup> “Philosophers have recently argued that we should revise our understanding of character. An individual’s behaviour is governed not by a set of ‘global’ traits, each elicited by a certain kind of situational feature, they argue, but by a much larger array of ‘local’ traits, each elicited by a certain combination of situational features. But the data cited by these philosophers support their theory only if we conceive of traits purely in terms of stimulus and response, rather than in the more traditional terms of inner mental items such as inclinations. We should not adopt the former conception, moreover, since doing so would impede pursuit of the ethical aims for which we need a theory of character, whereas retaining the latter conception will facilitate this pursuit. So we should not revise our understanding of character in the way proposed.”

<sup>184</sup> „Der heutige Mensch steht im Spannungsfeld von zunehmender Individualisierung und fortschreitender Globalisierung. Ein funktionierendes Ethikmodell muß diesen neuen Bedingungen Rechnung tragen. Ansätze bieten in sehr ähnlicher Weise eine auf Aristoteles zurückgreifende Tugendethik und kommunitaristische Moralentwürfe. Doch beide, Kommunitarismus und Tugendethik, widersetzen sich oftmals gerade der Universalisierung. Die Vermittlung von Werten innerhalb einer überschaubaren Gemeinschaft steht im Vordergrund. Unterschiede zu anderen ethischen Auffassungen in anderen Gemeinschaften werden ohne weiteres akzeptiert. Können Tugendethik und Kommunitarismus somit

- 2005 [687] Welchman, Jennifer (2005): *Virtue Ethics and Human Development: A Pragmatic Approach*, in *Virtue Ethics, Old and New*, hrsg. von Stephen M. Gardiner, Ithaca, S. 142–55.
- 2006 [688] Welchman, Jennifer (Hrsg.) (2006): *The Practice of Virtue. Classic and Contemporary Readings in Virtue Ethics*, Indianapolis.<sup>185</sup>
- 2016 [689] West, Ryan (2016): *Anger and the Virtues. A Critical Study in Virtue Individuation*, *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 46, S. 877–97.<sup>186</sup>
- 1997 [690] White, John R. (1997): *Virtue and Freedom*, *International Philosophical Quarterly* 37, S. 413–422.
- 1991 [691] White, Richard (1991): *Historical Perspectives on the Morality of Virtue*, *Journal of Value Inquiry* 25, S. 217–31.
- 2008 [692] White, Richard (2008): *Radical Virtues: Moral Wisdom and the Ethics of Contemporary Life*, Lanham.<sup>187</sup>

---

wirklich eine tragfähige Basis für ein modernes Moralkonzept bieten? Die Arbeit beschäftigt sich mit dieser zentralen Frage und prüft die Alltagstauglichkeit beider Ethikkonzepte anhand der in aktuellen Debatten diskutierten Phänomene, wie dem der moralischen Dilemmata. Es zeigt sich, daß die tugendethisch-kommunitaristische Denkrichtung hier interessante und neue Impulse geben kann.“

<sup>185</sup> This collection provides readings from five classic thinkers with importantly distinct approaches to virtue theory, along with five new essays from contemporary thinkers that apply virtue theories to the resolution of practical moral problems. Jennifer Welchman’s Introduction discusses the history of virtue theory. A short introduction to each reading highlights the distinctive aspects of the view expressed. TABLE OF CONTENTS: Preface. Introduction. PART I: CLASSIC VIRTUE THEORIES: Aristotle: Introduction. Nicomachean Ethics. Seneca: Introduction. On the Happy Life. Moral Letters to Lucilius. Francis Hutcheson: Introduction. An Inquiry into the Original of our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue. David Hume: Introduction. An Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals. Friedrich Nietzsche: Introduction. On the Genealogy of Morality. Beyond Good and Evil. PART II: CONTEMPORARY APPLICATIONS: Rosalind Hursthouse: Applying Virtue Ethics to Our Treatment of the Other Animals. Julia Annas: Seneca: Stoic Philosophy as a Guide to Living. Mark H. Waymack: Francis Hutcheson, Virtue Ethics and Public Policy. Jacqueline Taylor: Humean Humanity Versus Hate. Clancy W. Martin: Nietzsche’s Virtues and the Virtues of Business.

<sup>186</sup> „Aristotle and others suggest that a single virtue – ‘good temper’ – pertains specifically to anger. I argue that if good temper is a single virtue, it is constituted by aspects of a combination of other virtues. I present three categories of anger-relevant virtues – those that (potentially) dispose one to anger; those that delay, mitigate, and qualify anger; and those required for effortful anger control – and show how virtues in each category make distinct contributions to good temper. In addition to clarifying the relationship between anger and the virtues, my analysis has theoretical implications for virtue individuation more generally, and practical implications for character cultivation.“

<sup>187</sup> Contents: Introduction. Chapter One: Courage. Chapter Two: Temperance. Chapter Three: Justice. Chapter Four: Compassion. Chapter Five: Wisdom. Conclusion.

“What is a good life? What does it mean to be a good person? Richard White answers these questions by considering aspects of moral goodness through the virtues: courage, temperance, justice, compassion and wisdom. White explores how moral virtues affect and support social movements such as pacifism, environmentalism, multiculturalism, and animal rights. Drawing on the works of Plato, Aristotle, Hume, Nietzsche and others, White’s philosophical treatment of virtue ethics is extended through historical and

- 2006 [693] Wielenberg, Erik J. (2006): Saving Character, *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* 9, S. 461–91.<sup>188</sup>
- 1996 [694] Wiggins, David (1996): Natural and Artificial Virtues: A Vindication of Hume’s Scheme, in *How Should One Live? Essays on the Virtues*, hrsg. von Roger Crisp, Oxford, S. 131–40.
- 1995 [695] Williams, Bernard (1995): Acting as the Virtuous Person Acts, in *Aristotle and Moral Realism*, hrsg. von R. Heinamen, London, S. 13–23.
- 1995 [696] Williams, Bernard (1995): Ethics, in *Philosophy. A Guide through the Subject*, hrsg. von A. C. Grayling, Oxford, S. 545–82: S. 571–75 (“Virtues”).
- 1998 [697] Williams, Bernard (1998): Virtues and Vices, in *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, hrsg. von Edward Craig, Vol. 9, London, S. 626–31.
- 2025 [698] Wiinikka-Lydon, Joseph (2025): Dirty Virtue, *The Journal of Ethics* 27, S. 515–37.<sup>189</sup>
- 2011 [699] Winter, Michael (2011): *Rethinking Virtue Ethics*, Berlin.<sup>190</sup>
- 2012 [700] Winter, Michael Jeffrey (2012): Does Moral Virtue Require Knowledge? A Response to Julia Driver, *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* 15, S. 533–46.<sup>191</sup> – Zu [191].

---

cross-cultural analysis, and he examines the lives of Socrates, Buddha, and Gandhi who lived virtuous lives to help the reader understand and acquire moral wisdom.”

<sup>188</sup> “In his recent book *Lack of Character*, Jon Doris argues that people typically lack character (understood in a particular way). Such a claim, if correct, would have devastating implications for moral philosophy and for various human moral projects (e.g. character development). I seek to defend character against Doris’s challenging attack. To accomplish this, I draw on Socrates, Aristotle, and Kant to identify some of the central components of virtuous character. Next, I examine in detail some of the central experiments in social psychology upon which Doris’s argument is based. I argue that, properly understood, such experiments reveal differences in the characters of their subjects, not that their subjects lack character altogether. I conclude with some reflections on the significance of such experiments and the importance of character.”

<sup>189</sup> “Michael Walzer’s foundational essay on dirty hands raises the very possibility of a good person in politics. Dilemmas in the context of high stakes situations sometimes require politicians to compromise their morality and character for the sake of the greater good by choosing the lesser evil. Much has been written about dirty hands, but little has been said about Walzer’s implicit virtue ethics. This essay sketches this implicit virtue ethics, which is central to Walzer’s argument. These are “dirty” virtues, however, that allow one to choose the lesser evil in a dilemma while recognizing that, although evil was mitigated, and some degree of good achieved, wrong done is still wrong done. For this to work, Walzer argues the politician must be and feel guilty, making this an odd virtue ethics that requires a degree of suffering from the politician. The essay further develops this notion of dirty virtue through comparison with Lisa Tessman’s “burdened virtue,” arguing at the end that the guilt and instrumental suffering, which are so central to Walzer’s virtue ethic, may be more corrosive to practical reasoning and character than Walzer allows for.”

<sup>190</sup> Introduction. 1. Moral Realism and Virtue Ethics. 2. A Sketch of an Aristotelian Science of Ethics. 3. How Are Ethical Principles Known? 4. Some Challenges to the Deductive Model. Appendix: Can Unconditional Moral Principles be Justified?

<sup>191</sup> “A long-standing tenet of virtue theory is that moral virtue and knowledge are connected in some important way. Julia Driver attacks the traditional assumption that virtue requires knowledge. I argue that the examples of virtues of ignorance Driver offers are not compelling and that the idea that knowledge is required for virtue has been taken to be foundational for virtue theory for good reason. I propose that we

- 2006 [701] Winter, Michael/Tauer, John (2006): Virtue Theory and Social Psychology, *Journal of Value Inquiry* 40, S. 73–82.
- 2007 [702] Wolf, Susan (2007): Moral Psychology and the Unity of the Virtues, *Ratio* 20, S. 145–67.<sup>192</sup>
- 2006 [703] Woodcock, Scott (2006): Philippa Foot’s Virtue Ethics Has an Achilles’ Heel, *Dialogue* 45, S. 445–68.<sup>193</sup>
- 1963 [704] Wright, Georg Henrik von (1963): *The Varieties of Goodness*, Bristol 1993, S. 136–54 (“Virtue”).
- 2021 [705] Wright, Jennifer Cole/Warren, Michael T./Snow, Nancy E. (2020): *Understanding Virtue: Theory and Measurement*, Oxford.<sup>194</sup>

---

understand modesty as involving three conditions: 1) having genuine accomplishments, 2) being aware of the value of these accomplishments, and 3) having a disposition to refrain from putting forward one’s accomplishments. When we understand modesty this way, we can properly identify genuine cases of modesty and see how modesty requires knowledge. Something similar can be said about other alleged virtues of ignorance. With the proposal in place, we have no serious reason to think that moral virtue requires ignorance. Additionally, we have good reasons for thinking that acting virtuously requires having good intentions and that a necessary condition of having a virtue is having knowledge. Although some might take these results to be trivial or obviously true, I think the Julia Driver’s challenge should not be dismissed out of hand. Even though there are some reasons for thinking that some situations suggest that knowledge and virtue can be separated from one another, close analysis reveals this impression is only surface deep.”

<sup>192</sup> “The ancient Greeks subscribed to the thesis of the Unity of Virtue, according to which the possession of one virtue is closely related to the possession of all the others. Yet empirical observation seems to contradict this thesis at every turn. What could the Greeks have been thinking of? The paper offers an interpretation and a tentative defence of a qualified version of the thesis. It argues that, as the Greeks recognized, virtue essentially involves knowledge – specifically, evaluative knowledge of what matters. Furthermore, such knowledge is essentially holistic. Perfect and complete possession of one virtue thus requires the knowledge that is needed for the possession of every other virtue. The enterprise of trying to reconcile the normative view embodied in this conception of virtue with empirical observation also serves as a case study for the field of moral psychology in which empirical and normative claims are often deeply and confusingly intertwined.”

<sup>193</sup> “My aim in this article is to argue that Philippa Foot fails to provide a convincing basis for moral evaluation in her book *Natural Goodness*. Foot’s proposal fails because her conception of natural goodness and defect in human beings either sanctions prescriptive claims that are clearly objectionable or else it inadvertently begs the question of what constitutes a good human life by tacitly appealing to an independent ethical standpoint to sanitize the theory’s normative implications. Foot’s appeal to natural facts about human goodness is in this way singled out as an Achilles’ heel that undermines her attempt to establish an independent framework for virtue ethics. This problem might seem to be one that is uniquely applicable to the bold naturalism of Foot’s methodology; however, I claim that the problem is indicative of a more general problem for all contemporary articulations of virtue ethics.”

<sup>194</sup> “The last thirty years have seen a resurgence of interest in virtue among philosophers, psychologists, and educators. Over time, this interdisciplinary conversation has included character cultivation and education, in addition to more abstract, theoretical discussions of virtue. As is often the case when various disciplinary endeavors become entwined, this renewed interest in virtue cultivation faces an important challenge—

- 1996 [706] Zagzebski, Linda Trinkhaus (1996): *Virtues of the Mind. An Inquiry into the Nature of Virtue and the Ethical Foundations of Knowledge*, Cambridge.
- 1997 [707] Zagzebski, Linda Trinkhaus (1997): Virtue in Ethics and Epistemology, *American Catholic Philosophical Quarterly* 71, Suppl., S. 1–17.
- 2006 [708] Zagzebski, Linda Trinkhaus (2006): The Admirable Life and the Desirable Life, in *Values and Virtues: Aristotelianism in Contemporary Ethics*, hrsg. von Timothy Chappell, Oxford, S. 53–66.
- 2010 [709] Zagzebski, Linda (2010): Exemplarist Virtue Theory, *Metaphilosophy* 41, S. 41–57.<sup>195</sup>
- 2023 [710] Zagzebski, Linda (2023): Virtue Ethics, *Think* 22, S. 15–21.<sup>196</sup>
- 2013 [711] Zwolinski, Matt/Schmidtz, David (2013): Environmental Virtue Ethics: What it is and what it needs to be, in *Cambridge Companion to Virtue Ethics*, hrsg. von Daniel C. Russell, Cam-

---

namely, meeting the varying requirements imposed by different disciplinary standards. For virtue in particular, this means developing an account that practitioners from multiple disciplines find sufficiently rigorous, substantive, and useful. This volume represents a response to this interdisciplinary challenge. This co-authored book not only provides a framework for quantifying virtues, but also explores how we can understand virtue in a philosophically-informed way that is compatible with the best thinking available in personality psychology. Its objective is twofold: first, drawing on whole trait theory in psychology and Aristotelian virtue ethics, it offers accounts of virtue and character that are both philosophically sound and psychologically realistic. Second, the volume presents strategies for how virtue and character can be translated into empirically measurable variables and, thus, measured systematically, relying on the insights from the latest research in personality, social, developmental, and cognitive psychology, and psychological science more broadly. This volume presents a major contribution to the emerging science of virtue measurement and character, demonstrating just how philosophical understanding and psychological research can enrich each other."

<sup>195</sup> "In this essay I outline a radical kind of virtue theory I call exemplarism, which is foundational in structure but which is grounded in exemplars of moral goodness, direct reference to which anchors all the moral concepts in the theory. I compare several different kinds of moral theory by the way they relate the concepts of the good, a right act, and a virtue. In the theory I propose, these concepts, along with the concepts of a duty and of a good life, are defined by reference to exemplars, identified directly through the emotion of admiration, not through a description. It is an advantage of the theory that what makes a good person good is not given a priori but is determined by empirical investigation. The same point applies to what good persons do and what states of affairs they aim at. The theory gives an important place to empirical investigation and narratives about exemplars analogous to the scientific investigation of natural kinds in the theory of direct reference."

<sup>196</sup> "Is ethics all about rights and duties, or is it about living a happy, flourishing life? For millennia in the West, ethics was about the way to flourish as an individual and a community. The qualities that enable people to live that way are the virtues, and that style of ethics is called Virtue Ethics. In the early modern period, Virtue Ethics went out of fashion and ethics began to focus on right and duties, where rights and duties are demands made against others. In this article I argue that the language of rights and duties has made it almost impossible for people on opposing sides of public policy issues to come to agreement. I defend the return of Virtue Ethics in philosophy, and propose that if it can be adopted by ordinary people, we will have a better chance at overcoming our deep divisions."

bridge, S. 221–39.