

**Literatur zu moralischen Dilemmata**  
**Bibliography on Moral Dilemmas**

Last Update: 30.05.2011

Jörg Schroth ([jschrot@gwdg.de](mailto:jschrot@gwdg.de))

Alphabetische Ordnung / alphabetical order: <http://www.ethikseite.de/bib/bdilem.pdf>

Chronologische Ordnung / reverse chronological order: <http://www.ethikseite.de/bib/cdilem.pdf>

- 2011 [1] Alvarez, Silvina (2011): Constitutional Conflicts, Moral Dilemmas, and Legal Solutions. *Ratio Juris* 24, S. 59–74.<sup>1</sup>
- 2011 [2] Dougherty, M. V. (2011): *Moral Dilemmas in Medieval Thought. From Gratian to Aquinas*, Cambridge.<sup>2</sup>
- 2009 [3] Goble, Lou (2009): Normative Conflicts and The Logic of ‘Ought’, *Noûs* 43, S. 450–89.<sup>3</sup>
- 2008 [4] Boshammer, Susanne (2008): Von schmutzigen Händen und reinen Gewissen – Konflikte und Dilemmata als Problem der Ethik, in *Grundkurs Ethik*. Band 1: *Grundlagen*, hrsg. von Johannes S. Ach, Kurt Bayertz und Ludwig Siep, Paderborn, S. 143–61.
- 2008 [5] Kühler, Michael (2008): Moralische Dilemmata, die Gefahr moraltheoretischer Inkonsistenz und der zugrunde gelegte Pflichtbegriff, *Zeitschrift für philosophische Forschung* 62, S. 516–36.
- 2008 [6] Sellmaier, Stephan (2008): *Ethik der Konflikte. Über den moralisch angemessenen Umgang mit ethischem Dissens und moralischen Dilemmata*, Stuttgart.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> “The article focuses on the definition of constitutional conflicts as moral dilemmas. It discusses the conception of tragic conflicts by which “loss” is a distinctive feature that identifies both moral and constitutional dilemmas. It also asserts the peculiarity of constitutional conflicts vis-à-vis moral dilemmas, as well as the possibility of legal solutions to constitutional conflicts.”

<sup>2</sup> Contents: Preface. Introduction. 1. Gratian and his Glossators on conflicts in the natural law. 2. Twenty moral dilemmas from two early 13th-century summaries of theology: William of Auxerre’s *Summa aurea* and the Franciscan *Summa Halesiana*. 3. Raymond Lull and moral ensnarement in the *Vita coetanea*. 4. Thomas Aquinas, moral dilemmas, and a missing article from *Quodlibet XII*. 5. Thomas Aquinas on failures of practical reasoning: why *synderesis* doesn’t inoculate agents against malformed conscience dilemmas. 6. Moral dilemmas in the early Thomistic tradition: Johannes Capreolus and the deceiving demon dilemma. Conclusion. Bibliography. Index.

<sup>3</sup> “On the face of it, normative conflicts are commonplace. Yet standard deontic logic declares them to be logically impossible. That prompts the question, What are the proper principles of normative reasoning if such conflicts are possible? This paper examines several alternatives that have been proposed for a logic of ‘ought’ that can accommodate normative conflicts, and finds all of them unsatisfactory as measured against three criteria of adequacy. It then introduces a new logic that does meet all three criteria, and so allows for the possibility of genuine normative conflicts.”

<sup>4</sup> Vorwort. 1 Moralische Konflikte. 1.1 Moralische Konflikte – ethischer Dissens – moralische Dilemmata. 1.2 Ethischer Dissens. 1.2.1 Was ist ethischer Dissens. 1.2.2 Ethischer Dissens und absolute ethische Theorien. 1.2.3 Ethischer Dissens und der metaethische Relativismus. 1.3 Moralische Dilemmata. 1.3.1 Was sind moralische Dilemmata. 1.3.2 Moralische Gefühle. 1.3.3 Deontische Prinzipien. 1.3.4

- 2007 [7] Backström, Joel (2007): *The Fear of Openness. An Essay on Friendship and the Roots of Morality*, Åbo, S. 417–50 (“Moral dilemmas”).
- 2007 [8] van Zyl, Liezl (2007): Can Virtuous People Emerge from Tragic Dilemmas Having Acted Well?, *Journal of Applied Philosophy* 24, S. 50–61.<sup>5</sup>
- 2006 [9] Bagnoli, Carla (2006): Breaking Ties: The Significance of Choice in Symmetrical Moral Dilemmas, *Dialectica* 60, S. 157–69.<sup>6</sup>
- 2006 [10] Dovi, Suzanne (2006): *Sophie’s Choice: Letting Chance Decide*, *Philosophy and Literature* 30, S. 174–89.
- 2006 [11] Herbst, Catarina/Lembcke, Oliver (2006): Tragische Konflikte und notwendige Entscheidungen – Bemerkungen zur Idee rechtsfreier Räume im Verfassungsstaat, *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik* 14, hrsg. von B. Sharon Byrd, Joachim Hruschka und Jan C. Joerden, S. 385–405.

---

Konsequenzen für die ethische Theoriebildung. 2 Moralische Probleme. 2.1 Moralische Probleme. 2.2 Dynamik des ethischen Alltags. 2.3 Beispiele in der Ethik. 2.3.1 Die theoretische Rolle von Beispielen. 2.3.2 Verschiedene Arten von Beispielen. 2.4 Ethischer Dissens. 2.4.1 Probleme mit Beispielen für einen ethischen Dissens. 2.4.2 Beispiele für einen ethischen Dissens. 2.5 Moralische Dilemmata. 2.5.1 Probleme mit Beispielen für moralische Dilemmata. 2.5.2 Beispiele. 3 Ethik der Konflikte. 3.1 Eine andere Sichtweise: Ethik der Konflikte. 3.2 Die Bewältigung moralischer Dilemmata. 3.2.1 Kontingenz. 3.2.2 Vagheit und Gewichtung. 3.2.3 Inkommensurabilität und Unvergleichbarkeit. 3.2.4 Uneindeutigkeit. 3.2.5 Ahnungslosigkeit. 3.2.6 Zusammenfassung. 3.3 Der Umgang mit ethischem Dissens und seine Bewältigung. 3.3.1 Verstehen – Akzeptieren. 3.3.2 Wertdifferenz der Optionen. 3.3.3 Eindeutigkeit. 3.3.4 Vermeidung. Literaturverzeichnis. Personenregister. Sachregister.

<sup>5</sup> “A tragic dilemma is thought to arise when an agent, through no fault of her own, finds herself in a situation where she must choose between two courses of action, both of which it would be wrong to undertake. I focus on tragic dilemmas that are resolvable, that is, where a reason can be given in favour of one course of action over another, and my aim is to examine whether Hursthouse’s virtue-ethical account of right action succeeds in avoiding two problems presented by tragic dilemmas. The first of these is that they produce the seemingly contradictory conclusion that an agent, in doing what she ought to do, acts wrongly, making it appropriate for her to feel guilt. The second is the paradox of moral luck, which consists in the conflict between the intuition that an agent cannot be held responsible for actions that are not fully voluntary, and the fact that she may nevertheless believe that she has done something morally reprehensible. I argue that if we accept Hursthouse’s separation of action guidance and action assessment, her account succeeds in solving the problem of contradiction. However, it does not completely avoid the problem of moral luck. I argue, against Hursthouse, that the virtuous agent can emerge from a tragic dilemma having acted well, and that this is the conclusion we must arrive at if we want to avoid the problem of contradiction and of moral luck.”

<sup>6</sup> “In symmetrical moral dilemmas, the agent faces a choice between two incompatible actions, which are equally justified on the basis of the same value. These cases are generally discounted as spurious or irrelevant on the assumption that, when there is no failure of commensurability, choice between symmetrical requirements is indifferent and can be determined by randomization. Alternatively, this article argues that the appeal to randomization allows the agent to overcome a deliberative impasse, but it does not really resolve the moral dilemma. This is because randomization fails to provide the agent with a genuine reason for action. The argument is based on an account of arbitrariness as a threat to the agent’s authorship on action. By focusing on lack of authorship, rather than on failure of commensurability, we gain the adequate perspective to assess the philosophical significance of moral dilemmas, their impact on the agential integrity, and their consequences for ethical theory.”

- 2006 [12] McInerny, Daniel (2006): *The Difficult Good. A Thomistic Approach to Moral Conflict and Human Happiness*, New York.<sup>7</sup>
- 2006 [13] Marino, Patricia (2006): Expressivism, Logic, Consistency, and Moral Dilemmas, *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* 9, S. 517–33.<sup>8</sup>
- 2006 [14] Vossenkuhl, Wilhelm (2006): *Die Möglichkeit des Guten. Ethik im 21. Jahrhundert*, München, S. 122–27 („Moralische Dilemmata, das Beispiel der Organtransplantation“).
- 2006 [15] Williston, Byron (2006): Blaming Agents in Moral Dilemmas, *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* 9, S. 563–76.<sup>9</sup>
- 2005 [16] DeMarco, Joseph P. (2005): Principlism and Moral Dilemmas: A New Principle, *Journal of Medical Ethics* 31, S. 101–105.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>7</sup> “The claim that human agents are vulnerable to tragic conflict, situations in which one cannot help but do wrong, is a commonplace in contemporary moral philosophy. This book draws on Thomas Aquinas’s moral thought in order to delineate an alternative view. While affirming that the human good can be attained only through difficulty, including the difficulty of moral conflict, it argues that Aquinas’s understanding of a natural, hierarchical ordering of human goods allows for the rational resolution of moral conflict in a way that avoids tragic necessity.”

Contents: Introduction: The Difficult Good. – Incommensurability and Tragic Conflict. – The Business of Order. – The Real Thing. – Virtue and the Twofold Order. – Practical Reasoning and Final Ends. – Natural Hierarchy and Moral Obligation. – Conflict. – The Virtues of Conflict.

<sup>8</sup> “On an expressivist view, ethical claims are understood as expressions of our attitudes, desires, and feelings. A famous puzzle for this view concerns the use of logic in ethical reasoning, and two standard treatments try to solve the puzzle by explaining logical inconsistency in terms of conflicting attitudes. I argue, however, that this general strategy fails: because we can reason effectively even in the presence of conflicting moral attitudes – in cases of moral dilemmas – avoiding these conflicts cannot be a ground for correct moral reasoning. The result is a dilemma for expressivists: if they take all kinds of attitudes to be under consideration, then conflict cannot play the required role, since attitudes can fail to be compatible in cases of moral conflict. If they restrict attention to ‘all-in attitudes’ or to intentions or plans, then there is an important notion of obligation, used in standard arguments – one for which conflicts are allowed – that they fail to capture. I explain why expressivists should be especially tolerant of conflicting attitudes, and I conclude that they should pursue a different strategy for grounding logical normativity.”

<sup>9</sup> “Some philosophers – notably Bernard Williams, Martha Nussbaum and Ruth Barcan Marcus – argue that agents in moral dilemmas are blameworthy whatever they do. I begin by uncovering the connection these philosophers are presupposing between the agent’s judgement of wrongdoing and her tendency to self-blame. Next, I argue that while dilemmatic choosers cannot help but see themselves as wrongdoers, they both can and should divorce this judgement from an ascription of self-blame. As I argue, dilemmatic choosers are morally sui generis in that their actions result in a diminishment of their personal integrity with no corresponding failure of character. It is this that makes them non-blameworthy wrongdoers. This way of seeing the problem should provide dilemmatic choosers with a novel conception of their own moral psychology, one that allows them to view their actions in a manner that is given neither to moral insensitivity nor to pathological self-accusation.”

<sup>10</sup> “Moral conflicts occur in theories that involve more than one principle. I examine basic ways of dealing with moral dilemmas in medical ethics and in ethics generally, and propose a different approach based on a principle I call the “mutuality principle”. It is offered as an addition to Tom Beauchamp and James Childress’ principlism. The principle calls for the mutual enhancement of basic moral values. After explaining the principle and its strengths, I test it by way of an examination of three responses-in the recent Festschrift for Dr Raanon Gillon-to a case involving parental refusal of a blood transfusion. The strongest

- 2005 [17] Mellema, Gregory (2005): Moral Dilemmas and Offence, *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* 8, S. 291–98.<sup>11</sup>
- 2005 [18] Verbin, N. (2005): The Mystique of Moral Dilemmas, *Ratio* 18, S. 221–36.<sup>12</sup>
- 2004 [19] Schaber, Peter (2004): Are There Insolvable Moral Conflicts?, in *Practical Conflicts. New Philosophical Essays*, hrsg. von Peter Baumann und Monika Betzler, Cambridge, S. 279–94.
- 2003 [20] Horty, John F. (2003): Reasoning with Moral Conflicts, *Noûs* 37, S. 557–605.
- 2002 [21] Brune, Jens Peter (2002): Dilemma, in *Handbuch Ethik*, hrsg. von Marcus Düwell, Christoph Hübenthal und Micha H. Werner, Stuttgart, S. 325–331.
- 2002 [22] Carr, David (2002): Feelings in Moral Conflict and the Hazards of Emotional Intelligence, *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* 5, S. 3–21.
- 2002 [23] Holbo, John (2002): Moral Dilemmas and the Logic of Obligation, *American Philosophical Quarterly* 39, S. 259–74.
- 2002 [24] McConnell, Terrance C. (2002): Moral Dilemmas, *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, hrsg. von Edward N. Zalta, <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/moral-dilemmas/>
- 2002 [25] Morscher, Edgar (2002): The Definition of Moral Dilemmas: A Logical Confusion and a Clarification, *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* 5, S. 485–91. – Zu [27].
- 2001 [26] Cowley, Christopher (2001): Moral Dilemmas in Greek Tragedies: a Discussion of Aeschylus’s Agamemnon and Sophokles’s Antigone, *Etica e Politica / Ethics and Politics* 3 (1), [http://www.univ.trieste.it/~etica/2001\\_1/](http://www.univ.trieste.it/~etica/2001_1/).<sup>13</sup>

---

response is the one that comes closest to the requirements of the mutuality principle but yet falls short. I argue that the mutuality principle provides an explicit future orientation in principlism and gives it greater moral coherence.”

<sup>11</sup> “In 1963 Roderick Chisholm proposed a category of acts called “offences” to capture what he called acts of “permissive ill-doing.” Chisholm’s proposal has proven to be controversial. Here I propose that some progress can be made in validating acts of offence by focusing upon moral dilemmas. Given the problems which have been alleged to beset moral dilemmas, this may initially seem like a puzzling strategy. However, I will call attention to a type of moral dilemma unlike what is standardly discussed in the literature and attempt to show that those who acknowledge that such dilemmas are possible are likewise obliged to acknowledge that acts of offence are possible. My suggestion, then, is that, since the former are plausible to acknowledge, so are the latter.”

<sup>12</sup> “The paper is concerned with the question of the existence of moral dilemmas, conceived of as situations involving a subject in a conflict of non-overridden moral obligations. I reject some of the presuppositions underlying discussions of this question and argue that certain morally relevant choices cannot be evaluated in relation to an all-things-considered moral obligation as permissible or impermissible, right or wrong. In arguing for the inadequacy of our ordinary moral predicates for fully capturing the nature of such choices, I argue that they are, in certain respects, inexpressible.”

<sup>13</sup> “By looking at the situations faced by the protagonists of two classic plays (in purely philosophical terms rather than literary-critical or historical), I try to shed light on what it means to face an insoluble moral dilemma, what it might mean to deal with it, and how the dilemma can reveal certain crucial information about the decision-maker (i) to us readers-spectators, (ii) to other characters in the play who witness, or are implicated by, the incident, (iii) as well as, and perhaps most importantly, to the protagonist himself. In so doing, I distinguish the above dilemmas from moral-prudential dilemmas and from apparent dilemmas constituted by the mere lack of epistemological access. Indeed, I generally resist the various reductive

- 2001 [27] De Haan, Jurriaan (2001): The Definition of Moral Dilemmas: A Logical Problem, *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* 4, S. 267–84.<sup>14</sup> – Vgl. dazu: [25].
- 2001 [28] Marino, Patricia (2001): Moral Dilemmas, Collective Responsibility, and Moral Progress, *Philosophical Studies* 104, S. 203–225.<sup>15</sup>
- 2001 [29] Murphy, Mark C. (2001): *Natural Law and Practical Rationality*, Cambridge, S. 240–46 (“Moral Dilemmas”).
- 2001 [30] Nussbaum, Martha (2001): Comment [on J. J. Thomson’s “Goodness and Advice”], in Judith Jarvis Thomson, *Goodness and Advice*, Princeton, S. 97–125: S. 113–25.
- 2001 [31] Weber, Verena (2002): *Tugendethik und Kommunitarismus. Individualität, Universalisierung, Moralische Dilemmata*, Würzburg.<sup>16</sup>
- 2000 [32] Baltzly, Dirk (2000): Moral Dilemmas are Not a Local Issue, *Philosophy* 75, S. 245–63.
- 2000 [33] Betzler, Monika (2000): Moralische Dilemmata und die Rationalität residualer Gefühle, *Studia Philosophica. Jahrbuch der Schweizerischen Philosophischen Gesellschaft* 59, S. 195–224.

---

approaches characteristic of much analytic moral philosophy, and challenge the notion of a uniquely right answer to which all rational moral agents can be held accountable.”

<sup>14</sup> “This paper concerns one of the undecided disputes of modern moral philosophy: the possibility of moral dilemmas. Whereas proponents of the possibility of moral dilemmas often appeal to moral experience, many opponents refer to ethical theory and deontic logic. My aim in this paper is to clarify some of the tension between moral experience and ethical theory with respect to moral dilemmas. In Part One I try to show that a number of logical arguments against the possibility of moral dilemmas, though apparently very different, turn out to be basically the same, as they are all based on the following concept of ‘ought’: if A ought to be done, doing B is impermissible and doing A itself is permissible. In Part Two I present an overview of several definitions of moral dilemmas that have been given by proponents of moral dilemmas: definitions that define moral dilemmas in terms of oughts and definitions that define them in terms of reasons. I conclude that, while ‘reason’ is too weak, ‘ought’ is too strong a concept to define moral dilemmas with. In this way, the arguments from Part One create a logical problem for proponents of the possibility of moral dilemmas to define moral dilemmas.”

<sup>15</sup> “Ruth Marcus has offered an account of moral dilemmas in which the presence of dilemmas acts as a motivating force, pushing us to try to minimize predicaments of moral conflict. In this paper, I defend a Marcus-style account of dilemmas against two objections: first, that if dilemmas are real, we are forced to blame those who have done their best, and second, that in some cases, even a stripped down version of blame seems inappropriate. My account highlights the importance of collective responsibility in understanding dilemmas, and I suggest that it sheds light on understanding moral progress.”

<sup>16</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 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.“

- 2000 [34] Nussbaum, Martha (2000): The Cost of Tragedy: Some Moral Limits of Cost-Benefit Analysis, *Journal of Legal Studies* 29, S. 1005–36.<sup>17</sup>
- 2000 [35] Weber, Todd Bernard (2000): Tragic Dilemmas and the Priority of the Moral, *Journal of Ethics* 4, S. 191–209.
- 1999 [36] Hansson, Sven Ove (1999): ‘But What Should I Do?’, *Philosophia* 27, S. 433–40.
- 1999 [37] Hursthouse, Rosalind (1999): *On Virtue Ethics*, Oxford, S. 43–62 (“Resolvable Dilemmas”), S. 63–87 (“Irresolvable and Tragic Dilemmas”).
- 1999 [38] Zangwill, Nick (1999): Dilemmas and Moral Realism, *Utilitas* 11, S. 71–90.<sup>18</sup>
- 1998 [39] Hansson, Sven Ove (1998): Should We Avoid Moral Dilemmas?, *Journal of Value Inquiry* 32, S. 407–16.
- 1998 [40] Hart, W. A. (1998): Nussbaum, Kant and Conflict Between Duties, *Philosophy* 73, S. 609–18.
- 1998 [41] Kagan, Shelly (1998): *Normative Ethics*, Boulder, S. 180–83.
- 1998 [42] Ricken, Friedo (1998): *Allgemeine Ethik*, 3., erweiterte und überarbeitete Auflage, Stuttgart u. a., S. 186–89 („Moralische Konflikte und moralische Dilemmata“).
- 1998 [43] Zoglauer, Thomas (1998): *Normenkonflikte – zur Logik und Rationalität ethischen Argumentierens*, Stuttgart-Bad Canstatt.
- 1997 [44] Anderson, John P. (1997): Sophie’s Choice, *Southern Journal of Philosophy* 35, S. 439–450.
- 1997 [45] Joerden, Jan C. (1997): Der Widerstreit zweier Gründe der Verbindlichkeit. Konsequenzen einer These Kants für die strafrechtliche Lehre von der „Pflichtenkollision“, *Jahrbuch für Recht und Ethik* 5, hrsg. von B. Sharon Byrd, Joachim Hruschka und Jan C. Joerden, S. 43–52.
- 1997 [46] Sieckmann, Jan-R. (1997): Zur Analyse von Normkonflikten und Normabwägungen, in *Analytomen 2. Proceedings of the 2nd Conference “Perspectives in Analytical Philosophy”*, hrsg. von Georg Meggle, Berlin, Vol. III, S. 349–56.

---

<sup>17</sup> “In all situations of choice, we face a question that I call “the obvious question”: what shall we do? But sometimes we also face, or should face, a different question, which I call “the tragic question”: is any of the alternatives open to us free from serious moral wrongdoing? Discussing cases of tragic conflict from literature, philosophy, and contemporary life, I argue that it is valuable to face the tragic question where it is pertinent, because facing it helps us think how we might design a society where such unpalatable choices do not confront people, or confront them less often. Cost-benefit analysis helps us answer the obvious question; but it does not help us either pose or answer the tragic question, and it frequently obscures the presence of a tragic situation, by suggesting that the obvious question is the only pertinent question. I apply these reflections to thinking about basic entitlements of citizens, such as might be embodied in constitutional guarantees.”

<sup>18</sup> “I distinguish two different arguments against cognitivism in Bernard Williams’s writings on moral dilemmas. The first turns on there being a truth of the matter about what we ought to do in a moral dilemma. That argument can be met by appealing to our epistemic shortcomings and to pro tanto obligations. However, those responses make no headway with the second argument, which concerns the rationality of the moral regret that we feel in dilemma situations. I show how the rationality of moral regret can be explained on an ‘independent desire’ model. And I show how Williams’s second argument only appears to have force because of a certain faulty way of conceiving the issue over cognitivism. But Williams’s argument rightly alerts us to the rational role of desire in our moral thought.”

- 1997 [47] Zoglauer, Thomas (1997): Normenkonflikte. Zum Problem deontischer Widersprüche in Normensystemen, in *Analyomen 2. Proceedings of the 2nd Conference "Perspectives in Analytical Philosophy"*, hrsg. von Georg Meggle, Berlin, Vol. III, S. 403–10.
- 1996 [48] Blackburn, Simon (1996): Dilemmas: Dithering, Plumping, and Grief, in *Moral Dilemmas and Moral Theory*, hrsg. von H. E. Mason, Oxford, S. 127–39.
- 1996 [49] Brink, David O. (1994): Moral Conflict and Its Structure, *Philosophical Review* 103, S. 215–47. Wiederabgedruckt in *Moral Dilemmas and Moral Theory*, hrsg. von H. E. Mason, Oxford 1996, S. 102–26.
- 1996 [50] Dahl, Norman O. (1996): Morality, Moral Dilemmas, and Moral Requirements, in *Moral Dilemmas and Moral Theory*, hrsg. von H. E. Mason, Oxford, S. 86–101.
- 1996 [51] Gowans, Christopher W. (1996): Moral Theory, Moral Dilemmas, and Moral Responsibility, in *Moral Dilemmas and Moral Theory*, hrsg. von H. E. Mason, Oxford, S. 199–215.
- 1996 [52] Hill, Jr., Thomas E. (1996): Moral Dilemmas, Gaps, and Residues: A Kantian Perspective, in *Moral Dilemmas and Moral Theory*, hrsg. von H. E. Mason, Oxford, S. 167–98. Wiederabgedruckt in Hill, *Human Welfare and Moral Worth. Kantian Perspectives*, Oxford 2002, S. 362–402.
- 1996 [53] Hursthouse, Rosalind (1996): Normative Virtue Ethics, in *How Should One Live? Essays on the Virtues*, hrsg. von Roger Crisp, Oxford, S. 19–36: S. 28–36.
- 1996 [54] McConnell, Terrance C. (1996): Moral Residue and Dilemmas, in *Moral Dilemmas and Moral Theory*, hrsg. von H. E. Mason, Oxford, S. 36–47.
- 1996 [55] Marcus, Ruth Barcan (1996): More about Moral Dilemmas, in *Moral Dilemmas and Moral Theory*, hrsg. von H. E. Mason, Oxford, S. 23–35.
- 1996 [56] Mason, H. E. (1996): Responsibilities and Principles: Reflections on the Sources of Moral Dilemmas, in *Moral Dilemmas and Moral Theory*, hrsg. von H. E. Mason, Oxford, S. 216–35.
- 1996 [57] Mason, H. E. (Hrsg.) (1996): *Moral Dilemmas and Moral Theory*, Oxford.
- 1996 [58] Mothersill, Mary (1996): The Moral Dilemmas Debate, in *Moral Dilemmas and Moral Theory*, hrsg. von H. E. Mason, Oxford, S. 66–85.
- 1996 [59] Railton, Peter (1996): The Diversity of Moral Dilemma, in *Moral Dilemmas and Moral Theory*, hrsg. von H. E. Mason, Oxford, S. 140–66.
- 1996 [60] Sinnott-Armstrong, Walter (1996): Moral Dilemmas and Rights, in *Moral Dilemmas and Moral Theory*, hrsg. von H. E. Mason, Oxford, S. 48–65.
- 1996 [61] Statman, Daniel (1996): Hard Cases and Moral Dilemmas, *Law and Philosophy* 15, S. 117–48.
- 1996 [62] Zimmerman, Michael J. (1996): *The Concept of Moral Obligation*, Cambridge, S. 207–31 ("Dilemmas")
- 1995 [63] Foot, Philippa (1995): Moral Dilemmas Revisited, in *Modality, Morality, and Belief. Essays in Honor of Ruth Barcan Marcus*, hrsg. von Walter Sinnott-Armstrong, Diana Raffman und Nicholas Asher, Cambridge, S. 117–28. Wiederabgedruckt in Foot, *Moral Dilemmas and Other Topics in Moral Philosophy*, Oxford 2002, S. 175–88. – Moralische Dilemmata in neuer Betrachtung, in dies., *Die Wirklichkeit des Guten. Moralphilosophische Aufsätze*, hrsg. und eingeleitet von Ursula Wolf und Anton Leist, Frankfurt a. M., S. 197–213.

- 1995 [64] Greenspan, Patricia S. (1995): Perspectival Guilt, in *Modality, Morality, and Belief. Essays in Honor of Ruth Barcan Marcus*, hrsg. von Walter Sinnott-Armstrong, Diana Raffman und Nicholas Asher, Cambridge, S. 129–51.
- 1995 [65] Greenspan, Patricia S. (1995): *Practical Guilt. Moral Dilemmas, Emotions, and Social Norms*, New York.
- 1995 [66] Hursthouse, Rosalind (1995): Fallacies and Moral Dilemmas, *Argumentation* 9, S. 1–16.
- 1995 [67] Norcross, Alastair (1995): Should Utilitarianism Accommodate Moral Dilemmas?, *Philosophical Studies* 79, S. 59–84.
- 1995 [68] Statman, Daniel (1995): *Moral Dilemmas*, Amsterdam.
- 1994 [69] Gowans, Christopher W. (1994): *Innocence Lost. An Examination of Inescapable Moral Wrongdoing*, New York, Oxford.
- 1994 [70] Horty, John F. (1994): Moral Dilemmas and Nonmonotonic Logic, *Journal of Philosophical Logic* 23, S. 35–65.
- 1993 [71] Dancy, Jonathan (1993): *Moral Reasons*, Oxford, S. 123–25.
- 1993 [72] Donagan, Alan (1993): Moral Dilemmas, Genuine and Spurious: A Comparative Anatomy, *Ethics* 104, S. 7–21. Wiederabgedruckt in Donagan, *The Philosophical Papers of Alan Donagan Volume I: Action, Reason and Value*, hrsg. von J. E. Malpas, Chicago 1994, S. 153–68 sowie in *Moral Dilemmas and Moral Theory*, hrsg. von H. E. Mason, Oxford 1996, S. 11–22.
- 1993 [73] McConnell, Terrance C. (1993): Dilemmas and Incommensurateness, *Journal of Value Inquiry* 27, S. 247–52.
- 1993 [74] McDonald, Julie (1993): Thin Examples of Moral Dilemmas, *Social Theory and Practice* 19, S. 225–37.
- 1993 [75] Ohlsson, Ragnar (1993): Who Can Accept Moral Dilemmas?, *Journal of Philosophy* 90, S. 405–15.
- 1992 [76] Day, John P. (1992): More on Moral Dilemmas, *Philosophy* 67, S. 399–406.
- 1992 [77] Morris, Michael (1992): Moral Conflict and Ordinary Emotional Experience, *Journal of Value Inquiry* 26, S. 223–37.
- 1992 [78] Railton, Peter (1992): Pluralism, Determinacy, and Dilemma, *Ethics* 102, S. 720–42.
- 1992 [79] Statman, Daniel (1992): A New Argument for Genuine Moral Dilemmas?, *Journal of Value Inquiry* 26, S. 565–71.
- 1992 [80] Vallentyne, Peter (1992): Moral Dilemmas and Comparative Conceptions of Morality, *Southern Journal of Philosophy* 30, S. 117–24.
- 1991 [81] Day, John P. (1991): Moral Dilemmas, Compromise, and Compensation, *Philosophy* 66, S. 369–75.
- 1991 [82] Jacquette, Dale (1991): Moral Dilemmas, Disjunctive Obligations, and Kant's Principle that 'Ought' Implies 'Can', *Synthese* 88, S. 43–55.
- 1991 [83] McCarty, Richard (1991): Moral Conflicts in Kantian Ethics, *History of Philosophy Quarterly* 8, S. 65–79.
- 1991 [84] Mann, William E. (1991): Jephthah's Plight: Moral Dilemmas and Theism, *Philosophical Per-*



*spectives 5: Philosophy of Religion*, S. 617–47.

- 1991 [85] Sorensen, Roy A. (1991): Moral Dilemmas, Thought Experiments, and Conflict Vagueness, *Philosophical Studies* 63, S. 291–308.
- 1991 [86] Statman, Daniel (1991): The Debate over the So-Called Reality of Moral Dilemmas, *Philosophical Papers* 19, S. 191–212.
- 1990 [87] Almeida, Michael J. (1990): Deontic Logic and the Possibility of Moral Conflict, *Erkenntnis* 33, S. 57–71.
- 1990 [88] DeCew, Judith Wagner (1990): Moral Conflicts and Ethical Relativism, *Ethics* 101, S. 27–41.
- 1990 [89] Herman, Barbara (1990): Obligation and Performance: A Kantian Account of Moral Conflict, in *Identity, Character, and Morality. Essays in Moral Psychology*, hrsg. von Owen Flanagan und Amélie Oksenberg Rorty, Cambridge, Mass., S. 311–37. Wiederabgedruckt als “Obligation and Performance” in Herman, *The Practice of Moral Judgment*, Cambridge, Mass. 1993, S. 159–83.
- 1990 [90] Lebus, Bruce (1990): Moral Dilemmas: Why They Are Hard to Solve, *Philosophical Investigations* 13, S. 110–25.
- 1990 [91] MacIntyre, Alasdair (1990): Moral Dilemmas, *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 50, Suppl., S. 367–82.
- 1990 [92] Paske, Gerald H. (1990): Genuine Moral Dilemmas and the Containment of Incoherence, *Journal of Value Inquiry* 24, S. 315–23.
- 1989 [93] Conee, Earl (1989): Why Moral Dilemmas are Impossible, *American Philosophical Quarterly* 26, S. 133–41.
- 1989 [94] Gowans, Christopher W. (1989): Prescriptivism and Moral Dilemmas, *American Philosophical Quarterly* 26, S. 187–98.
- 1989 [95] Vallentyne, Peter (1989): Two Types of Moral Dilemmas, *Erkenntnis* 30, S. 301–8.
- 1988 [96] Benn, Stanley I. (1984): *A Theory of Freedom*, Cambridge, S. 4364 (“Reasons in Conflict: Quandaries and Consistency”).
- 1988 [97] Bonevac, Daniel/Seung, T. K. (1988): Conflict in Practical Reasoning, *Philosophical Studies* 53, S. 315–45.
- 1988 [98] Goldman, Alan H. (1988): *Moral Knowledge*, London, S. 140–44 (“Conflicts Within Frameworks”).
- 1988 [99] McConnell, Terrance C. (1988): Interpersonal Moral Conflicts, *American Philosophical Quarterly* 25, S. 25–35.
- 1988 [100] Sinnott-Armstrong, Walter (1988): *Moral Dilemmas*, Oxford.
- 1987 [101] Gowans, Christopher W. (1987): Introduction: The Debate on Moral Dilemmas, in *Moral Dilemmas*, hrsg. von Christopher W. Gowans, Oxford, S. 3–33.
- 1987 [102] Gowans, Christopher W. (Hrsg.) (1987): *Moral Dilemmas*, Oxford.
- 1987 [103] Odegard, Douglas (1987): Deep Moral Dilemmas, *Theoria* 53, S. 73–86.
- 1987 [104] Sinnott-Armstrong, Walter (1987): Moral Dilemmas and ‘Ought and Ought not’, *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 17, S. 127–39.
- 1987 [105] Sinnott-Armstrong, Walter (1987): Moral Realisms and Moral Dilemmas, *Journal of Philoso-*

phy 84, S. 263–76.

- 1987 [106] Stocker, Michael (1987): Moral Conflicts: What They Are and What They Show, *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* 68, S. 104–123.
- 1987 [107] Vallentyne, Peter (1987): Prohibition Dilemmas and Deontic Logic, *Logique et Analyse* 18, S. 113–22.
- 1986 [108] Feldman, Fred (1986): *Doing the Best We Can*, Dordrecht, S. 197–209.
- 1986 [109] Hudson, Stephen D. (1986): *Human Character and Morality. Reflections from the History of Ideas*, Boston, S. 12–24.
- 1986 [110] Levi, Isaac (1986): *Hard Choices. Decision Making Under Unresolved Conflict*, Cambridge.
- 1986 [111] McConnell, Terrance C. (1986): More on Moral Dilemmas, *Journal of Philosophy* 82, S. 345–51.
- 1986 [112] Raz, Joseph (1986): *The Morality of Freedom*, Oxford, S. 357–66 (“Moral Dilemmas”).
- 1986 [113] Sayre-McCord, Geoffrey (1986): Deontic Logic and the Priority of Moral Theory, *Nous* 20, S. 179–97.
- 1986 [114] Smith, Holly M. (1986): Moral Realism, Moral Conflict and Rational Choice, *Journal of Philosophy* 83, S. 341–45. – Zu [124].
- 1985 [115] Anderson, Lyle V. (1985): Moral Dilemmas, Deliberation, and Choice, *Journal of Philosophy* 82, S. 139–62.
- 1985 [116] Carey, Toni V. (1985): What Conflict of Duty Is Not, *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* 66, S. 204–15.
- 1985 [117] Jackson, Frank (1985): Davidson on Moral Conflict, in *Actions and Events: Perspectives on the Philosophy of D. Davidson*, hrsg. von Ernest LePore und Brian P. McLaughlin, Oxford, S. 104–15.
- 1985 [118] Nussbaum, Martha (1985): Aeschylus and Practical Conflict, *Ethics* 95, S. 233–67. Wiederabgedruckt in Nussbaum, *The Fragility of Goodness*, Cambridge 1985, S. 25–50.
- 1985 [119] Nussbaum, Martha (1985): *The Fragility of Goodness*, Cambridge, S. 25–84 (“Part I: Tragedy: fragility and ambition”).
- 1985 [120] Primorac, Igor (1985): Hare on Moral Conflicts, *Analysis* 45, S. 171–75.
- 1985 [121] Sinnott-Armstrong, Walter (1985): Moral Dilemmas and Incomparability, *American Philosophical Quarterly* 22, S. 321–29.
- 1985 [122] Slote, Michael (1985): Utilitarianism, Moral Dilemmas, and Moral Cost, *American Philosophical Quarterly* 22, S. 161–68.
- 1985 [123] Swank, Casey (1985): Reasons, Dilemmas, and the Logic of ‘Ought’, *Analysis* 45, S. 111–16.
- 1985 [124] Tännsjö, Torbjörn (1985): Moral Conflict and Moral Realism, *Journal of Philosophy* 82, S. 113–17. – Vgl. dazu [114].
- 1984 [125] Baumrin, Bernard H./Lupu, Peter (1984): A Common Occurrence: Conflicting Duties, *Metaphilosophy* 15, S. 77–90.
- 1984 [126] Benn, Stanley I. (1984): Persons and Values: Reasons in Conflict and Moral Disagreement, *Ethics* 95, S. 20–37.
- 1984 [127] Donagan, Alan (1984): Consistency in Rationalist Moral Systems, *Journal of Philosophy* 81, S.

- 291–309. Wiederabgedruckt in *Moral Dilemmas*, hrsg. von Christopher W. Gowans, Oxford 1987, S. 271–90.
- 1983 [128] Foot, Philippa (1983): Moral Realism and Moral Dilemma, *Journal of Philosophy* 80, S. 379–98. Wiederabgedruckt in *Moral Dilemmas*, hrsg. von Christopher W. Gowans, Oxford 1987, S. 250–70 sowie in Foot, *Moral Dilemmas and Other Topics in Moral Philosophy*, Oxford 2002, S. 37–58. – Zu [147].
- 1983 [129] Greenspan, Patricia S. (1983): Moral Dilemmas and Guilt, *Philosophical Studies* 43, S. 117–25.
- 1982 [130] Conee, Earl (1982): Against Moral Dilemmas, *Philosophical Review* 91, S. 87–97. Wiederabgedruckt in *Moral Dilemmas*, hrsg. von Christopher W. Gowans, Oxford 1987, S. 239–49.
- 1981 [131] Hare, R. M. (1981): *Moral Thinking: Its Levels, Method and Point*, Oxford, S. 26–35. – *Moralisches Denken: Seine Ebenen, seine Methode, sein Witz*, Frankfurt a. M. 1992, S. 70–81.
- 1981 [132] McConnell, Terrance C. (1981): Utilitarianism and Conflict Resolution, *Logique et Analyse* 24, S. 245–57.
- 1980 [133] Hare, R. M. (1980): Moral Conflicts, in *The Tanner Lectures on Human Values I*, hrsg. von S. McMurrin, Salt Lake City, S. 169–93.
- 1980 [134] Marcus, Ruth Barcan (1980): Moral Dilemmas and Consistency, *Journal of Philosophy* 77, S. 121–36. Wiederabgedruckt in *Moral Dilemmas*, hrsg. von Christopher W. Gowans, Oxford 1987, S. 188–204.
- 1979 [135] Guttenplan, Samuel (1979/80): Moral Realism and Moral Dilemmas, *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 80, S. 61–80.
- 1979 [136] Williams, Bernard (1979): Conflicts of Values, in *The Idea of Freedom: Essays in Honour of Isaiah Berlin*, hrsg. von Alan Ryan, Oxford. Wiederabgedruckt in Williams, *Moral Luck*, Cambridge 1981, S. 71–82: S. 73–75. – Konflikte von Werten, in Williams, *Moralischer Zufall*, Königstein/Ts. 1984, S. 82–93: S. 84–86.
- 1978 [137] McConnell, Terrance C. (1978): Moral Dilemmas and Consistency in Ethics, *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 7, S. 269–87. Wiederabgedruckt in *Moral Dilemmas*, hrsg. von Christopher W. Gowans, Oxford 1987, S. 154–73.
- 1977 [138] Donagan, Alan (1977): *The Theory of Morality*, Chicago, S. 143–57.
- 1976 [139] McConnell, Terrance C. (1976): Moral Dilemmas and Requiring the Impossible, *Philosophical Studies* 29, S. 409–13.
- 1973 [140] Schüller, Bruno (1973): *Die Begründung sittlicher Urteile. Typen ethischer Argumentation in katholischen Moraltheologie*, Düsseldorf, S. 154–63 („Die sogenannte Pflichtenkollision“).
- 1973 [141] van Fraassen, Bas (1973): Values and the Heart’s Command, *Journal of Philosophy* 70, S. 5–19. Wiederabgedruckt in *Moral Dilemmas*, hrsg. von Christopher W. Gowans, Oxford 1987, S. 138–53. – Dazu: [70].
- 1973 [142] Walzer, Michael (1973): Political Action: The Problem of Dirty Hands, *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 2, S. 160–80.
- 1971 [143] Trigg, Roger (1971): Moral Conflict, *Mind* 80, S. 42–55.
- 1969 [144] Phillips, D. Z./Mounce, H. O. (1969): *Moral Practices*, London, S. 79–103 (“Moral Dilemmas”).

- 1967 [145] Mallock, David (1967): Moral Dilemmas and Moral Failure, *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* 45, S. 159–78.
- 1965 [146] Atkinson, R. F. (1965): Consistency in Ethics, *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* Suppl. Vol. 39, S. 125–38. – Zu [147].
- 1965 [147] Williams, Bernard (1965): Ethical Consistency, *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, Suppl. Vol. 39, S. 103–124. Wiederabgedruckt in Williams, *Problems of the Self: Philosophical Papers 1956–1972*, Cambridge 1972, S. 166–86 sowie in *Moral Dilemmas*, hrsg. von Christopher W. Gowans, Oxford 1987, S. 115–37. – Widerspruchsfreiheit in der Ethik, in Williams, *Probleme des Selbst. Philosophische Aufsätze 1956–1972*, Stuttgart 1978, S. 263–96.
- 1962 [148] Lemmon, Edward J. (1962): Moral Dilemmas, *Philosophical Review* 71, S. 139–58. Wiederabgedruckt in *Moral Dilemmas*, hrsg. von Christopher W. Gowans, Oxford 1987, S. 101–14.
- 1958 [149] Ladd, John (1958): Remarks on the Conflict of Obligation, *Journal of Philosophy* 55, S. 811–19.