SYNTHESIS PHILOSOPHICA
75 (1/2023) pp. (227–232)

229

Book Reviews

a new discipline and offers strategies for understanding the human world in general as a system, or more precisely as a system of signs, This new approach changes the understanding and, in some way, the object of the human sciences and has great consequences on aesthetics, literary theory and criticism. Actually, if we can find general principles to understand the mechanism of our language, we can explain a work of art or our very human world according to similar principles." (p. 133.)

In this context, Euron places a special emphasis on Ferdinand de Saussure, Viktor Borisovich Shklovsky, and Roman Jakobson. On the other hand, critical theory – with its representatives in the so-called "Frankfurt School" – changed the understanding of the concept of "theory". Although "theory" was previously thought to be objective, the Frankfurt School and its representatives

"… proposed the opposite perspective. Theory is always a subjective, historical and often non-disinterested activity. We need a critical position; we have to ask the meaning of apparently self-evident truths and commonly accepted theories. And, when we ask, we always have to think of what we are asking, why we are asking, what is at stake in our asking." (P. 174.)

Later chapters are devoted to the practice of deconstruction (pp. 194–201), contemporary schools and traditions in literary and critical theory (pp. 202–210), and postmodern theories of art (pp. 211–225). Authors such as Jacques Derrida, Umberto Eco, and Italo Calvino were discussed here the most, while a large number of subchapters discussed "new theories" related to the problem of interpreting literary works. Therefore, it should be pointed out that Euron also wrote extensively about (I) feminist theory (pp. 204–205), (II) gender theory (pp. 205–206), (III) gay, lesbian, and queer theory (pp. 206–207), (IV) new historicism (p. 207), (V) postcolonial studies (pp. 207–209), and (VI) cultural materialism (pp. 209–210). In these subchapters, it is particularly intriguing how Euron sees the role of literary theory. Namely, he firmly believes that literary theory

"… gives a clue about something which is beyond the text, tackles complex problems, for example how the human world is organized and structured and how it can be understood, what is the meaning of 'understanding', what is at stake in our understanding of the world and which dangers we face in our attempt to understand it, why literary works always bring with them a theoretical meaning, and so on." (pp. 202–203.)

With all of the above in mind, it is safe to say that Paolo Euron's book *Aesthetics, Theory and Interpretation of the Literary Work* is an excellent study of the history of aesthetics, that provides a detailed and comprehensive overview of main topics, ideas, and concepts in their historical context and development.

The argumentation of the main thesis extends implicitly or explicitly throughout the entire book – regardless of whether the (sub)chapters are dedicated to a specific historical period, author, artistic and intellectual movement, discipline, or theory. By bringing aesthetics into connection with literary theory, critical theory, and linguistics, Euron gave this book an authentic note – which sets it apart from other books that deal with art and aesthetic theory in general. In addition to introducing readers to the problem of interpreting literary works, the book also provides an original introduction to aesthetic theory in Western culture. But perhaps the most important part of the book, besides the interesting thesis and consistent argumentation, is Euron's intention to remind his readers that in order to understand something so complex as a work of art (i.e, literary work), first of all, we need to enjoy it. And in order to enjoy a work of art to the fullest, we have to consider its "correct context" and its "specific artistic qualities" (p. XIII).

Jan Defrančeski

**Boran Berčić,
Aleksandra Golubović,
Majda Trobok (eds.)**

Human Rationality

Festschrift for Nenad Smokrović

Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Rijeci, Rijeka 2022

The main purpose of this book was to honour the philosopher and professor Nenad Smokrović by featuring 17 contributions, written in Croatian or English language, commenting on, expanding, implementing or criticising various aspects of his philosophical ideas, with an additional review containing Smokrović's response to the papers.

Smokrović's field of work is in analytical philosophy, or that branch of philosophy that attempts to solve philosophical problems by trying to find various logical and linguistic tools that have their purpose in the context of the philosophical problem they are dealing with. Following analytic philosophy, or at least its

SYNTHESIS PHILOSOPHICA
75 (1/2023) pp. (227–232)

230

Book Reviews

history, which begins with Gottlob Frege and Bertrand Russell, Smokrović's philosophy and the way he approaches philosophical questions remains faithful to the beginnings of analytic philosophy. Logic is a normative tool that is meant to confirm the correctness of our statements, a tool that delimits what are valid forms of thought presented in the form of arguments in contrast to what is simply "having an opinion". In this way, Smokrović remains directly faithful to Frege's logicism. However, given the development of philosophy, the methods and concepts have changed. Logic offers the possibility of constructing, reconstructing and deconstructing the flow of our attitudes and validating their correctness. Smokrović turned to the fact that our "logical and analytical abilities" must have a certain neurocognitive background, our ability to argue must have its background in our biology, activated by communication with other people.

Argument is not just a form of communication that we engage in; its purpose is to increase knowledge. That is, argumentation as an activity is a process of knowledge accumulation, and in other words, argumentation is an epistemological tool. The leap from logic to argumentation and the background on which argumentation takes place concerns quite explicitly the question of what it means to be rational. Against this background, we should get an image of what human rationality is, what form it takes, what transformative possibilities it has, and what the consequences of such a concept of rationality are. This collection attempts to reconstruct for us what human rationality is. To be rational would mean to follow a set of norms that are given to us as a standard for the rightness of our actions. Norms or logical rules are the foundation on which rational behaviour rests. That is, they are a generative force that enables exhaustive action and the accumulation of knowledge.

The book begins with the "Editors' Preface", which provides an insight into the motivation for publishing the book, a brief biography of Nenad Smokrović and an overview of all the papers included in *Festschrift*. In the following paragraphs I will briefly outline the content of each paper.

In the paper "The Future Sea Battle and Performing an Infinite Task: Two Remarkable Cases Concerning the Logicist Thesis", Miloš Arsenijević aimed to show how standard logic can be a measure or the norm of everyday rationalisation. Following in Smokrović's footsteps, the paper uses two examples to offer arguments for the claim that when there is a discrepancy between formal tools and everyday rationalisation, it is necessary to see at what moments the deviation occurs, and, on that basis, to expand our logical tools.

In the paper entitled "Funkcije rasuđivanja u individualnom i grupnom kontekstu" ("The Function of Judgment in Individual and Group Context"), Igor Bajšanski attempted to explain how argumentation in this context is an innate cognitive ability within communication and represents means by which people acquire, expand, and change their knowledge about the world. Even if this type of argumentation is an ideal prototype, it can still find its place in everyday rationalisation.

In "Teorija i klasifikacija pogreški u argumentaciji: stvarne i manje bitne razlike između dvaju pristupa" ("Theory and Classification of Fallacies in Argumentation: Real and Less Relevant Differences between Two Approaches"), Gabriela Bašić Hanžek compared the negative theory of argumentation (pragma-dialectic) with an epistemological approach to argumentation. According to the author, the difference only becomes clearer in cases of positive theories.

Hanoch Ben-Yami and Edi Pavlović, in their paper entitled "Completeness of the Quantified Argument Calculus on the Truth-Valuational Approach", presented a formal logical system called the Quantified Argument Calculus, based on predicate logic. The philosophical motivation for developing this system lies in the domain of true values. This system does not treat quantifiers as propositional operators, but combines them with unary predicates to form quantified arguments.

Boran Berčić in his work "*X is the best, but I prefer Y! On Values and Preferences*" points out that statements the likes of "X are the best, but I prefer Y!" are not contradictory. Berčić argues that it is necessary to work on the differences between preferences and values, and one does not derive from the other. If preferences and values are separated into two normative categories, it is possible to hold both dispositions.

Aleksandra Golubović and Jelena Kopajtić in their work "Svjetonazor i odgoj kritičkog mislitelja" ("The Worldview and Nurture of Critical Thinker") show us the advantages and difficulties of implementing critical thinking within the educational system.

Marko Jurjako argued in "Naturalizam i relativnost u pogledu praktičnih razloga" ("Naturalism and Relativity Concerning Practical Reasons") that we can approach the question of whether moral requirements provide reasons for rational action vis-à-vis all rational agents in the context of philosophical naturalism in two ways. The author's answer to this question is positive because there are moments when naturalism as a position can

SYNTHESIS PHILOSOPHICA
75 (1/2023) pp. (227–232)

231

Book Reviews

be rejected, but there might also be a moment when this position can be accepted.

In the paper "Argumentation, Knowledge and Reasoning", Paolo Labinaz critically examined the thesis that Smokrović takes as a starting point for the development of argumentation theory, i.e. the thesis that reasoning is argumentative in nature. Labinaz offered an alternative according to which reasoning need not be a decisive tool for the argumentative process, i.e. we can assume that reasoning is argumentative in nature, discarding the concept of reasoning, and replacing it with the reason-giving function of argumentation, which is cooperative in nature.

In the paper "How Rational are Human Beings? In Honor of Nenad Smokrović", Nenad Miščević has attempted to answer the problem of rationality. The work is a dialogue between Miščević and Smokrović, in which Miščević presented his theory of rationality (rational reasoning in five stages), which was intended to show that knowledge leads to correct moral thinking and irrationality appears as an epistemological flaw (epistemological virtue vs. epistemological vice).

In her work "Uloga logike u ljudskom zaključivanju" ("The Role of Logic in Human Reasoning"), Ines Skelac critically approaches the problem of the normativity of logic. More specifically, Skelac points out the divide that arises between proponents who argue that logic is not normative and support the idea of logical pluralism, and those who claim that logic is normative. The author leaves the question of the normativity of logic open because, as she argues, both sides have their strengths and negative aspects. On the one hand, logic should not be trivialised, but it should be explained how we choose the right tool for determining truth values in the plurality of logical tools. Logical pluralism is positive, but we do not use every logical system equally for all problems.

Matej Sušnik aimed to show the connection between theoretical and practical reasoning in his paper "Priroda praktičnog zaključivanja" ("The Nature of Practical Reasoning"). The author focused on showing how the elements of theoretical reasoning, those found in Smokrović, can be applied to the analysis of practical reasoning. The author finds a synthesis of these two forms of the reasoning of Bernard Williams.

Danilo Šuster in the paper titled "A Mid-Blue Logic" criticised the idea that deductive logic is normative, that is, Šuster argued that deductive logic has too poor an assortment of tools to describe the colorfulness of human practice. The author criticised Smokrović on the issue of logic and the fact that it is the bearer

of normativity. The author suggested that other forms of non-deductive logic are perhaps more flexible in the attempt to reconstruct everyday reasoning, but this also remains an open question.

Majda Trobok in the paper titled "The Role of Argumentation. In Honor of Nenad Smokrović" presented Smokrović's theory of argumentation, focusing on its relationship with properties, and identifying some of its shortcomings.

Andrej Ule, in "Implicit and Explicit Knowledge in Argumentation" criticised Smokrović's idea that the theory of argumentation is not powerful enough to make all norms of everyday practice explicit. Some things seem to be implicit and hidden in everyday life. The argumentation has its social character, but it is not able to make it explicit and show a rigid system of norms that form the cornerstone of rationality. For Ule, there are no such norms. Argumentation is a continuous process.

Lino Veljak in his paper "O utemeljenju metodologije znanstvenog istraživanja" ("On the Foundation of Methodology of Scientific Research"), criticised the idea of a methodological monism, or that all problems, including philosophical ones, can be explained by a mathematical-scientific vocabulary. And this vocabulary is the only normative tool available. Veljak warned against a form of positivist terror. In this work, too, Veljak's argumentation of the approach of scientific methodology detects Smokrović's disposition and groups him accordingly.

Michael Watkins in "The Mastery of a Concept: Dispositions and Skills" discussed Smokrović's view that the understanding of a certain concept is constitutively related to the fact that we must be in the disposition to grasp the determination of the assertion. With this, Smokrović commited to a form of analyticity. Smokrović defended his thesis against the counter-examples presented by Timothy Williamson. The author prefers Williamson's approach.

Timothy Williamson in "Idealized Rationality in Models of Knowledge and Probability" discussed how rational assumptions, such as logical omniscience, are embedded in standard models of epistemic and doxastic logic. Furthermore, the author discussed the consequences of the debate between internalist and hyper-internalist theories of attribution of attitudes.

Nenad Smokrović, in the closing paper "Acknowledgments, Comments and Answers" reviewed all the contributions included in this collection, commented on the authors' assertions and addressed objections.

SYNTHESIS PHILOSOPHICA
75 (1/2023) pp. (227–232)

232

Book Reviews

Smokrović acknowledges the criticisms raised by Watkins and is open to feedback from Ule and Šuster, with whom he engages in an ongoing dialogue. This willingness to evolve, modify and even reject some of his own ideas demonstrates a willingness to grow intellectually. This willingness to dialogue promotes a healthy exchange of ideas and cultivates an environment for intellectual progress. Accepting constructive criticism and participating in dialogue enables the refinement of philosophical thought and contributes to the advancement of knowledge in the field. Finally, it highlights the dynamic and ever-evolving nature of philosophical inquiry and the importance of incorporating diverse perspectives to enrich the discourse.

The book showcases Smokrović's ideas and demonstrates their wide-ranging applications in further research, highlighting the quality of the work presented. Despite its primary focus on analytical philosophy, the collection remains accessible and relevant to readers from various fields. I highly recommend this publication as a compelling and comprehensive representation of the philosopher's contributions.

Karlo Gardavski