

—In the Jewish Talmud, which is parallel to the Moslem Hadith, the *commentaries* to Scripture proceed by disagreement. That is, the views put into writing (and learned orally) disagree with each other all the time.

This type of disagreement is called *makhlóket*. It also a form in the sense that it is replicated in the way that the Talmud is learned. Those who study the Talmud pair up, and oppose each other. It is called *pilpul*. Chilly pepper.

The point being, that whatever your views are they should be learned in the flesh. And what is learned in this way emerges from different walks of life. If you look closely into pedagogic organisation of the Talmud, it is Aristotelian.

The *kabbalist* and poet [Moshe Chayim Luzzato](#) wrote a book called the Book of Logic, in which the topics of the Talmud are organised according to a declared Aristotelian system of classification: *substance* is core.

Where's the *beef*? That's the driving question. So, its disagreement with a system. A system, or method, of reaching a decision. The originality of the Talmud also lies in the way it itself is organised: answers *first* questions *after*.

When you read the short texts with the answers they have the clarity and cogency of an elementary and simple language. Then these answers are opened by questions. This text is much longer. Finally, you are confused.

This confusion is your own space, the moment before you realise that you have to take a stand/develop your own views. The principle: a good question is a *conversation-starter*, a matured question a *decision-maker*.

Such is the idea of cultivating a mutual dependency between life-experience and systematic knowledge. Where do we read about that? Well, it is precisely the point in Aristotle's *Ethics*: *phronesis* & *episteme*.

*Without* life-experience (*phronesis*) *no* ethics. It is a necessary condition, but not a sufficient one. You also need knowledge (*episteme*). So, we have two necessary reasons—experience and knowledge—but no sufficient reason.

Sufficient reason: if only I do x, y and z it will suffice, it will be enough. We know that it is not like this. Neither in life, art or art-life (or, work). It is not like this with the PhD in artistic research, neither broadly in artistic research.

Yet, we have to reach a decision. Enough! We say, and go to our peers with the work: they might disagree—even substantially—till in the end they say: enough! A decision is made.

To our blurb: “As a response to the crises in which certain forms of life and even bare life are no longer sustainable, care itself – as an umbrella term for *social reproduction* and *maintenance*, *attachments to concerns*, *repair* and *healing*, *listening*, *attention* and *precision* – is under fire.” When do we enough?