

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

PHILOSOPHY

COURSE UNIT OUTLINE 2018-19

<p style="text-align: center;">PHIL10021 Semester: 1 Credits: 20</p>

This course guide should be read in conjunction with the *Philosophy Study Guide 2018-19*, available from the Philosophy Intranet.

Lecturer(s): Dr Ann Whittle
Office: HBS 2.42
Telephone: 0161 275 4776
Email: Ann.Whittle@manchester.ac.uk
Office Hours: Thursdays 10am-11.50am
Please email to arrange an appointment outside of these hours.

Tutors: Tutorials will be taken by Teaching Assistants – see below.
Their office hours will be posted here:
<https://www.socialsciences.manchester.ac.uk/student-intranet/undergraduate/your-programme/philosophy/contact-us/>

Administrator: Christopher Ashworth, UG Office, G.001 Arthur Lewis Building
Tel: 0161 275 7129, Email: christopher.ashworth@manchester.ac.uk

Lectures: Thursday 12-2pm
Schuster, Bragg Theatre.

Tutorials: Allocate yourself to a tutorial group using the Student System
(this is compulsory and on a first come, first served basis)

Assessment: Exam 67%, Essay 33%

Reading Week: Monday 29th October 2018 – Friday 2nd November 2018

Philosophy Intranet: <http://www.socialsciences.manchester.ac.uk/student-intranet/undergraduate/course-information/philosophy/>
Please go to the intranet for staff and TA office hours, the Philosophy Study Guide, and advice on accessing online philosophy resources.

*****IMPORTANT INFORMATION – PLEASE READ*****

Pre-requisite(s): None

Communication: <i>Students must read their University e-mails regularly, as important information will be communicated in this way.</i>
--

Examination period: Monday 14 January – Friday 25 January 2019
Re-sit Examination period: Monday 19th August – Friday 30th August 2019

Please read this course outline through very carefully as it provides essential information needed by all students attending this course

2. ABOUT THE COURSE

Summary

This course unit will examine some difficult moral issues: Is it ever right to abort a foetus? What are our duties to animals? Is it ever right to torture the innocent? What should we be aiming for? What is goodness? By examining moral conundrums raised in applied ethics, normative ethics and metaethics, this course unit will provide an introduction to some central themes in moral philosophy.

Aims

The course aims to:

- introduce philosophical thinking about moral phenomena;
- present and clarify the basic terminology employed in exploring questions of morality;
- discuss some of the difficult issues raised in applied ethics.

Learning Outcomes

On successful completion of this course unit, students will be able to demonstrate:

- an ability to identify some major standpoints in ethical theory;
- an ability to articulate cogent arguments on applied moral issues;
- an ability to write concisely, relevantly and analytically about the moral issues discussed in the course, both in an essay and under exam conditions.

3. COURSE ORGANISATION

Lectures: Thursday 12-2pm

Tutorials:

DAY & TIME	LOCATION	TEACHING ASSISTANT
Monday 11-12pm	Sam Alex_A18	B.Magro
Monday 12-1pm	Sam Alex_A18	B.Magro
Monday 1-2pm	Sam Alex_A18	P.Lopez Cantero
Monday 2-3pm	Uni Place_3.210	P.Lopez Cantero
Thursday 2-3pm	Sam Alex_A18	W.Knowles
Thursday 3-4pm	Sam Alex_A18	P.Lopez Cantero
Thursday 4-5pm	Sam Alex_A18	P.Lopez Cantero
Friday 11-12pm	Sam Alex_A18	AM.McCallion

Friday 12-1pm	Sam Alex_A18	W.Knowles
Monday 3-4pm	Uni Place_3.205	P.Lopez Cantero
Friday 3-4pm	Sam Alex_A18	W.Knowles
Friday 4-5pm	Sam Alex_A18	W.Knowles
Friday 10-11am	Uni Place_6.208	AM.McCallion

Tutorials are weekly, **starting in week 2**. Attendance at tutorials is compulsory. It is students' responsibility to ensure that they have been allocated to a tutorial group. Students may not change group without permission.

Work and attendance

The work and attendance requirements for this course are that you:

- **Attend all tutorials**
If you are absent from a tutorial through illness you should inform your tutor and fill in a Certification of Student Ill Health (available from your department or from the SoSS UG Office; see your degree programme handbook for further details). If you are absent for another reason you should tell your tutor or the Philosophy Administrator, Chris Ashworth as soon as you can – if possible, *before* the tutorial.
- **Prepare adequately for tutorials**
You will be set preparatory work for tutorials; see the study budget below for a guide to roughly how long you should spend on this.
- **Complete written work on time**
Failure to complete assessed work by the due date constitutes a violation of the work and attendance requirement.

Violations of work and attendance requirements will be reported to your Programme Director. If you have difficulties (e.g. personal, financial or family problems) that result in persistent failure to meet the work and attendance requirements, you should talk to your Programme Director or Academic Advisor.

Texts recommended for purchase:

No texts must be purchased for this course. Tutorial readings will be made available via Blackboard, and recommended texts are available through the library and (in many cases) web. However, students may find it useful to buy/consult these overviews/collections:

- LaFollette, Hugh (ed.) (2002) *Ethics in Practice: An Anthology*, Blackwell: Oxford.
[Some key sections are reproduced online via Google Books]
- Kuhse, Helga and Singer, Peter (eds.) (1999) *Bioethics: An Anthology*, Blackwell: Oxford.
[There is a more recent (2006) edition, but I shall refer to the earlier edition
Some key sections of both editions are reproduced online via Google Books]
- Gensler, Harry (2011) *Ethics: A contemporary introduction*, Routledge: London
- Wolff, Jonathan (2016) *An Introduction to Moral Philosophy*, Norton: New York.

Course materials: Further materials will be made available on the courses Blackboard site. Log-in to Blackboard via My Manchester at: <https://online.manchester.ac.uk>

Study skills and online resources

The Philosophy intranet site, has lots of useful information and advice on, for example, essay-writing and accessing e-journals and other online resources. It includes an 'essay bank' containing a couple of actual student essays with lots of comments on them. You can also download the **Philosophy Study Guide**, find out about staff and TA contact details, etc.

Study budget

The University's Academic Standards Code of Practice specifies that a 20 credit course is expected to require about 200 hours work by students. For this course, you are recommended to break this down roughly as follows:

Lectures	10 x 2 = 20 hours
Tutorials	10 hours
Tutorial preparation	10 x 5 hours = 50 hours
Essay preparation	40 hours
Exam preparation	80 hours

TOTAL: 200 hours

Prompt arrival at classes

Students should note that all lectures and tutorials start **on the hour** and should end at 50 minutes past the hour. Late arrival for tutorials may result in your being marked absent; if you arrive late it is your responsibility to ensure that your tutor has marked you as present.

4. ASSESSMENT

Assessment Criteria

For the assessment criteria for PHIL course units, see the *Philosophy Study Guide* (available online at: <http://www.socialsciences.manchester.ac.uk/student-intranet/undergraduate/course-information/philosophy/study-resources/>) which also provides further guidance concerning the assessment criteria.

EXAMINATION

One two-hour exam will be set at the end of semester one, in which you must answer two questions. This provides two thirds of your assessment for the course. You will not be able to reproduce material from your assessed essay in your exam.

Past Exam Papers can be found on the Blackboard site for this course.

ASSESSED ESSAYS

One essay of 1,500 words (titles listed below) which provides one third of your assessment for this course.

The word limit includes footnotes but **excludes** the bibliography.

Students must state the word count at the end of the essay – failure to do so will result in a deduction of 2 marks.

If an essay goes over the word limit by 10% or more, 5 marks will be deducted.

Presentation

Essays must be typed in at least 12 point in a readable font, and should be **double spaced**. They should include proper bibliography and references.

When submitting electronically the title of the file you upload should be your student ID number followed by the question number. All essays are marked anonymously; please do not put your name on the filename or anywhere in the essay.

Bibliography and Referencing

The lack of a proper bibliography and appropriate references (citations) will potentially greatly affect the mark for the work and may be considered plagiarism.

For full guidance on how to refer to works you are citing and paraphrasing in your essay, and how to write a bibliography, is provided in Chapter 5 of the Philosophy Study Guide. **You MUST follow this guidance.** Bibliography and referencing conventions can vary from discipline to discipline, and the conventions in Philosophy may differ from those employed in other subjects you are studying.

Plagiarism

Plagiarism is a form of academic malpractice that can result in serious penalties, including deduction of marks, the award of a mark of 0, and – in the most serious cases – exclusion from the University. There is also philosophy-specific guidance on plagiarism (and how to avoid plagiarising accidentally) in Chapter 5 of the Philosophy Study Guide.

Students should also consult the University's statement on plagiarism, which can be obtained from the School of Social Sciences student intranet.

Submitting your essay

All Philosophy modules use online submission and marking only.

You must submit your essay electronically to 'Turnitin' via Blackboard. Further instructions on this are available on the Blackboard site for the course, see: <https://online.manchester.ac.uk>

When submitting electronically the title of your essay (i.e. the filename) should be your student ID number, followed by the question number, i.e. xxxxxx Qy.

Failure to submit an electronic copy of your essay will result in a mark of zero.

Deadline

The submission date for the assessed essay is **13/11/18**. All essays should be submitted **by 2pm** on the hand in day.

See the *Philosophy Study Guide* for information about the granting of extensions and penalties for unexcused late submission and for overlong essays.

Penalties for late submission of essays

Essays submitted after 2.00pm carry the following day's date.

Please see the Policy on the Submission of Work for Summative Assessment in relation to the institutional sliding scale for penalties relating to late submission of work (<http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/display.aspx?DocID=24561>).

Please note particularly point 4.7 *The mark awarded will reduce by 10 marks per day for 5 days (assuming a 0 -100 marking scale), after which a mark of zero will be awarded.*

Students who have a valid reason (*i.e.* mitigating circumstances with the necessary documentation) for not being able to submit their assessed essay on time should collect a mitigating circumstances form from the SoSS Undergraduate Office (Arthur Lewis Building, G.001), which should be completed and returned to G.001.

Accessing feedback for essays using online marking

Feedback on your assessed essay will be available on Blackboard no later than 15 working days after the essay deadline date (provided the essay is submitted on time).

To access the feedback please log into My Manchester and go to the **Blackboard** site for PHIL10021. Navigate to the **Submission of Coursework folder** and then click on and follow the instructions under: **'How to download your feedback from Turn it in'**

Please note that all essay marks are provisional until confirmed by the external examiner and the final examinations boards in June.

Students are welcome to discuss their essay with the course convenor during their office hours.

Feedback

The School of Social Sciences (SoSS) is committed to providing timely and appropriate feedback to students on their academic progress and achievement, thereby enabling students to reflect on their progress and plan their academic and skills development effectively. Students are reminded that feedback is necessarily *responsive*: only when a student has done a certain amount of work and approaches us with it at the appropriate fora is it possible for us to feed *back* on the *student's work*. The main forms of feedback on this course are written feedback responses to assessed essays and exam answers.

We also draw your attention to the variety of generic forms of feedback available to you on this as on all SoSS courses. These include: meeting the lecturer/tutor during their office hours; e-mailing questions to the lecturer/tutor; asking questions from the lecturer (before and after lecture); presenting a question on the discussion board on Blackboard; and obtaining feedback from your peers during tutorials.

Assessed Essay Titles

1. Assess this argument: 'Killing is wrong if and only if it deprives a person of a valuable future life; some terminally ill people do not have a valuable future life; so it is not wrong to kill them'.

[see reading list on Euthanasia below]

2. In what circumstances, if any, is abortion morally permissible?

[see reading list on 'Abortion' below]

5. COURSE OUTLINE

Week One: Introduction – No Tutorial

Week Two: Euthanasia

Week Three: Abortion

Week Four: Animal Rights

Week Five: Punishment

Week Six: Reading Week – no lecture or tutorial

Week Seven: Consequentialism – Part 1

Week Eight: Consequentialism – Part 2

Week Nine: Well-Being

Week Ten: Moral Luck

Week Eleven: Naturalising Ethics

Week Twelve: Revision – No Lecture

6. READING LIST

All reading lists are for guidance only! The texts listed should help you increase your understanding of the topics covered in the course, and help you prepare for the assessed essay and exam. But you are also encouraged to use your own initiative and find relevant articles and books by chasing up interesting footnotes, browsing real and virtual libraries, following your hunches, and so on.

IMPORTANT - PLEASE NOTE: The links worked at the time of compiling this reading list. If they no longer work, you will still be able to access the materials indicated through the library catalogue with your username and password. If you are struggling, get assistance from the library.

1) Introduction

*There is no tutorial or reading this week. But please do take time to browse a good contemporary introduction to ethics, for instance, Gensler, Harry (2011) *Ethics: A contemporary introduction*, Routledge 2011.*

2) Euthanasia

Required Tutorial Reading:

Pence, G. 'Why Physicians Should Aid the Dying' in *Ethics in Practice: An Anthology*, ed. H. LaFollete (1997, second edition) Blackwell: Oxford. [Download from Blackboard]

Highly Recommended Non-Philosophical Reading

Hill, Chris 'The Note', from Helga Kuhse *Willing to Listen: Wanting to Die*, (Victoria: Penguin Books 1994), pp.9-17. (Reprinted in *Bioethics: an anthology*, Singer and Kuhse)

Highly Recommended Philosophical Reading

Rachels, J. (1975) '[Active and Passive Euthanasia](#)' *New England Journal of Medicine*, vol. 9, pp.78-80. Reprinted in *Bioethics* (eds. Kuhse and Singer).

Further Reading:

Online materials (freely downloadable)

Podcasts: [Raymond Tallis on Assisted Dying](#)

[Peter Singer on Life and death Decision-Making](#)

Boonin, David (2000) '[How to Argue Against Active Euthanasia](#)' *Journal of Applied Philosophy* 17 (2):157–168.

Callahan, Daniel (1992) '[When Self-Determination Runs Amok](#)' *The Hastings Centre report*, vol. 2, pp.52-5.

Cholbi, Michael (2010) '[The Duty to Die and the Burdensomeness of Living](#)' *Bioethics* 24 (8):412-420.

Foot, Philippa (1977) '[Euthanasia](#)' *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 6 (2) pp.85-112.

Gastmandes, Chris and Lepeleire, Jan (2010) '[Living to the Bitter End? A Personalist Approach to Euthanasia in Persons with Severe Dementia](#)' *Bioethics* 24 (2):78-86.

Goldman, Holly Smith (1980) '[Killing, Letting Die, and Euthanasia](#)' *Analysis* 40 (4):224

Hardwig, John '[Is There a Duty to Die?](#)' *Hastings Center Report*, vol.27, no. 2 (1997): 34-42.

Kuhse, Helga (1998) '[Critical Notice: Why Killing Is Not Always Worse—and Is Sometimes Better—Than Letting Die.](#)' *Cambridge Quarterly of Healthcare Ethics* 7 (4):371-374.

McMahan, Jeff (1993) '[Killing, Letting Die, and Withdrawing Aid](#)' *Ethics*, vol. 103 pp.250-279.

Young, Robert (1996) '[Voluntary Euthanasia](#)' *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.

Books (some copies available in the library)

Dworkin, Gerald, Bok, Sissela and Frey, R. G. (1998) *Euthanasia and physician-assisted suicide*. CUP.

Ethics in Practice: An Anthology, ed. H. LaFollette, (2007) Blackwell: Oxford, essays on Euthanasia by Beauchamp, Hooker, Vellman, Hardwig and Cohn & Lynn.

Matters of Life and Death, ed. T. Regan (1993) McGraw-Hill, chapter 2, 'Euthanasia', J. Rachels.

Steinbock, Bonnie & Norcross, Alastair (eds.) (1994). *Killing and Letting Die*. Fordham University Press.

Reprinted: Bioethics: An Anthology, ed. H. Kuhse and P. Singer (1999) Blackwell: Oxford, chapters 20 (Glover), 24 (Rachels), 25 (Nesbitt), 26 (Kuhse), 34 (Dworkin), 35 (Dresser), 36 (Hill), 37 (Callahan), 38 (Admiraal) and 39 (Hardwig).

Tutorial Questions:

- (1) Is life a good in itself, or merely an instrumental good? How might differing views of this affect the euthanasia debate?
- (2) Is Pence right to say that what is wrong, is not 'killing humans' but 'killing humans who do not want to die' (p.25)?
- (3) How far should our autonomy stretch? If the argument for voluntary euthanasia is based on autonomy, should only 'terminally ill' cases be permitted?
- (4) Is the argument from mercy persuasive?
- (5) Do you think that any form of the slippery slope argument is sound?
- (6) Given that physicians in this country already practice passive euthanasia, would their role be significantly altered if this practice was extended to include active euthanasia?
- (7) Can we ever have a duty to die?

3) Abortion:

Required Tutorial Reading:

Thomson, Judith Jarvis (1971). [‘A Defense of Abortion’](#). *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 1 (1):47-66.

Highly Recommended Non-Philosophical Reading

[England’s Abortion Act, 1967](#)

(See Blackboard.)

Highly Recommended Philosophical Reading

Tooley, Michael (1972). [Abortion and Infanticide](#). *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 2 (1):37-65.

Further Reading:

Online materials (freely downloadable)

Conee, Earl (1999) [‘Metaphysics and the Morality of Abortion’](#) *Mind* 108 (432):619-646.

Denis, Lara (2008) [‘Animality and Agency: A Kantian Approach to Abortion’](#) *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 76 (1):117-37.

Finnis, John (1973) [‘The Rights and Wrongs of Abortion: A Reply to J.J. Thomson’](#) *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 2 pp. 117-145.

Gordon, John-Steward (2008) [‘Abortion’](#) *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.

Marquis, Don (1989). [‘Why Abortion is Immoral’](#) *Journal of Philosophy* 86 (4):183-202

Purdy, Laura (1990). [‘Are Pregnant Women Fetal Containers?’](#) *Bioethics* 4 (4):273–291.

Rhodes, Rosamond (1999) [“Abortion and assent.”](#) *Cambridge Quarterly of Healthcare Ethics* 8.04: 416-427.

Steinbock, Bonnie (2006) [“The morality of killing human embryos.”](#) *The Journal of Law, Medicine & Ethics* 34.1: 26-34

Books (some copies available in the library)

Ethics in Practice: An Anthology, ed. Hugh LaFollette, (2007) Blackwell: Oxford, essays on Abortion by Jarvis Thomson, Warren, Don Marquis, Little and Hursthouse.

Matters of Life and Death, ed. T. Regan (1993) McGraw-Hill, chapter 6 ‘Abortion’, J. Feinberg and B. Baum Levenbook.

Feinberg, Joel ed. (1973) *The Problem of Abortion*, Wadsworth: Belmont.

Kamm, F. M. (1992) *Creation and Abortion: a study in moral and legal philosophy*, OUP.

Steinbock, Bonnie. *Life before birth: the moral and legal status of embryos and fetuses*. Oxford University Press, 2011.

Tutorial Questions

- 1) What assumption does Thompson allow for the sake of argument?
- 2) Would the director of the hospital's request be "outrageous" (p.49) if the time you had to be plugged into the violinist was 1 week? 1 month? 10 years?
- 3) Does appeal to the right of self-defence undermine "the extreme view" (p.50)?
- 4) How can we compare rights? Do you agree with Thompson's weighting in the Henry Fonda case?
- 5) Do you agree with the conclusion Foot draws in the screen example (p.59)? What conclusions, if any, should we draw from this regarding the permissibility of abortion?
- 6) Should we derive "he has a right" from "you ought"?
- 7) Is the analogy with the case of the violinist undermined by the relationship the woman stands in to the unborn person?

4) Animal Rights

Required Tutorial Reading:

Peter Singer, 'All Animals are Equal' available online on Blackboard and at

<http://spot.colorado.edu/~heathwoo/phil1200,Spr07/singer.pdf>

Also in Hugh LaFollette, ed., *Ethics in Practice*, 1st, 2nd or 3rd edition, [1st edition pp.116-26.]

And Regan and Singer, eds., *Animal Rights and Human Obligations*, (New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1989) pp.148-62.

Highly Recommended Non-Philosophical Reading

Steward, Desmond 'The Limits of Troogshaft' from *Encounter*, London: 1972. Reprinted in *The Moral of the Story*, ed. P. Singer and R. Singer, Blackwell 2005.

Highly Recommended Philosophical Reading

McMahan, Jeff (2005) '[Our Fellow Creatures](#)' *The Journal of Ethics* 9: 353-380.

Further Reading:

Online materials (freely downloadable)

Podcast: [Gary Francione on Animal Abolitionism](#)

Fox, Michael. (1978) '[Animal Liberation: A Critique](#)', *Ethics* (1978). 106-118

Gruen, Lori, (2003) [The Moral Status of Animals](#), *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.

Hsiao, Timothy (2015) '[In Defence of Eating Meat](#)' *Journal of Agriculture and Environmental Ethics*, 28: 277-291.

Haworth, Lawrence. '[Rights, Wrongs and Animals](#)', *Ethics* (1978). 95-105.

Harrison, Jonathan (2008) '[The Vagaries of Vegetarianism](#)' *Ratio* vol. 21: 286-299.

Lee, Keekok. (1997) '[An Animal: What is it?](#)', *Environmental Values* 6: 393-410.

Regan, Thomas '[The Moral Basis of Vegetarianism](#)' *The Canadian Journal of Philosophy*, 5: 181-214.

Sunstein Cass and Nussbaum, Martha (ed.) (2004) '[Animal Rights](#)' OUP. This is a great book for the topic. See, in particular, the papers by Cora Diamond, Richard Epstein, Elizabeth Anderson and Martha Nussbaum.

Books (some copies available in the library)

Ethics in Practice: An Anthology, ed. Hugh LaFollette, (2007) Blackwell: Oxford, essays on Animal Rights by Fox, Frey and Regan.

Rudy, Kathy (2011) *Loving Animals Toward a New Animal Advocacy*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Singer, Peter., *Animal Liberation*, (London, 1990).

Tutorial Questions:

- 1) Is Singer's analogy between racism or sexism and speciesism a strong one?
- 2) How should we understand equality? Do you agree with Singer when he asserts that what matters is 'equality of consideration'? What does this amount to?
- 3) If an animal could be killed with zero suffering, would it still be wrong to kill it and eat it?
- 4) Is there a morally relevant distinction between experimenting on animals for purposes of medical research and farming and killing animals for purposes of dinner in nice restaurants?
- 5) Consider Singer's discussion of vivisection. Is he right to draw the parallel between experimenting on a non-human animal and experimenting on a human infant? What does this parallel show?
- 6) Do you think Benn offers a good defence of speciesism against Singer's criticisms?
- 7) Has doing this week's tutorial reading given you a view where previously you had none or changed your mind in either direction?

5) Punishment

Required Tutorial Reading:

Rachels, James. (1997) '[Punishment and Desert](#)' in *Ethics in Practice: An Anthology*, (1997 and 2007) ed. H. LaFollette, Blackwell: Oxford.

Highly Recommended: Case Study

Consider the case of Chemical Castration. See [here](#).

Highly Recommended Philosophical Reading

Rawls, John. (1955) 'Two Concepts of Rules', in Rawl's *Collected Papers* (ed. S. Freeman). 1999, Harvard University Press Cambridge. Read the introduction and section I. The relevant material is reprinted in *Ethics in Practice: An Anthology*, ed. H. LaFollette, (1997) Blackwell: Oxford.

Suggested Further Reading:

Online materials (freely downloadable)

Podcast: [Victor Tadros on Punishment](#)

Bedau, Hugo and Kelly, Erin (2003) '[Punishment](#)' *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.

Brownlee, Kimberley (2010). [Retributive, Restorative and Ritualistic Justice](#). *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies* 30 (2):385-397.

Farrell, D. M. (1985) '[The Justification of General Deterrence](#)' *The Philosophical Review*, vol. 94 pp.367-394.

Hampton, Jean 1984 '[The Moral Education Theory of Punishment](#)' *Philosophy and Public Affairs* vol.13, pp.208-238.

Kelly, Erin (2002) "[Doing without desert](#)." *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* 83.2, pp. 180-205.

Quinn, Warren (1985) '[The Right to Threaten and the Right to Punish](#)' *Philosophy and Public Affairs* vol. 19, pp.327-373.

Simmons, A. J. (1991) '[Locke and the Right to Punish](#)' *Philosophy and Public Affairs* vol. 19, pp.311-349.

Books or papers from books (some copies available in the library)

Ethics in Practice: An Anthology, ed. H. LaFollette, (1997) Blackwell: Oxford, essays on punishment by Rachels, Wright, Cullen and Beaver.

A Philosophy and Public Affairs Reader: Punishment, ed. A. J. Simmons, M. Cohen, J. Cohen and C. Beitz, (1995) Princeton University Press: Princeton, Part I.

Hart, H. L. A. 'Prolegomenon to the Principles of Punishment, in Hart's *Punishment and Responsibility*, Oxford University press: Oxford, 1968.

Tutorial Questions:

- 1) According to Rachels, how does the principle of deserts help us determine our own fates? Is his argument convincing?
- 2) If criminals don't profit from their crimes, does this render Rachels' second justification defunct?
- 3) How does Rachels' utilize utilitarian considerations to motivate the principle of desert?
- 4) Is there a morally significant difference between acts of revenge and retribution?
- 5) How might we challenge the claim that deterrence violates the principles of guilt, proportionality and excuses?
- 6) How might we challenge the claim that rehabilitation violates the principles of guilt, equal treatment and proportionality?
- 7) Are Rachels' proposed justifications for retribution undermined if we lack free will?

6) Reading Week

There is no tutorial or reading this week.

7) Consequentialism – Part 1

Required Tutorial Reading for Part 1

Mill, John Stuart (1863) [Utilitarianism, chapter 2](#).

Highly Recommended: Case Study

The Trolley Problem. For a watchable (!?) presentation [see here](#).

(See below for Consequentialism reading list)

Highly Recommended Philosophical Reading

Thompson, Judith Jarvis (1985) '[The Trolley Problem](#)' *The Yale Law Journal*, vol. 94 pp.1395-1415.

Tutorial Questions

- 1) What is 'the Greatest Happiness Principle'? According to Mill, upon what is it grounded? Is this a secure foundation?
- 2) Does Mill offer an adequate way of distinguishing between the higher and lower pleasures?
- 3) To whom does Mill think the Greatest Happiness Principle applies?
- 4) Is Mill's treatment of the case of the Martyr convincing?
- 5) Do you agree that morality demands us to be 'as strictly impartial as a disinterested and benevolent spectator'?
- 6) Is Mill right to separate the morality of the action from the motive by which it was performed?
- 7) Does Mill adequately answer the charge that utilitarianism demands too much of us?
- 8) How persuasive is Mill's response to the worry that 'there is not time, previous to action, for calculation and weighing the effects of any line of conduct on the general happiness'?

8) Consequentialism – Part 2

Required Tutorial Reading for Part 2

Williams, Bernard 'Consequentialism and Integrity' from Smart, J. and Williams, B. (1973) *Utilitarianism For and Against*, Cambridge University Press, pp.82-118. [Download from Blackboard]

Highly Recommended Non-Philosophical Reading

Ursula K. Le Guin 'The Ones Who Walk Away from Omelas' Reprinted in *The Moral of the Story*, ed. P. Singer and R. Singer, Blackwell 2005.

Highly Recommended Philosophical Reading

Mason, Elinor (1999) '[Do consequentialists have one thought too many?](#)' *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* 2 (3):243-261.

Tutorial Questions

- 1) How does Williams distinguish between a deontological approach to ethics, such as Kant's, and consequentialism?
- 2) Are some situations 'morally unthinkable'? What conclusions, if any, should we draw from this?
- 3) Do considerations for consequentialism illicitly slide between the claim that nothing is right 'whatever the consequences' and the claim that 'everything depends upon consequences'? How might a consequentialist defend herself?
- 4) Would you take the job/kill the man? Must consequentialists regard it as obvious what George/Jim should do?
- 5) Should we necessarily trust our moral feelings? Can we regard them as questionable whilst maintaining our integrity?
- 6) Should the discomfort felt by prejudiced people be allowed to count in the consequentialist calculus?
- 7) What is the doctrine of negative responsibility? Is it plausible?
- 8) Is it 'absurd' to demand that a man give up his deepest commitments and 'acknowledge the decision which utilitarian calculation requires'? Would this undermine his integrity? How might a consequentialist respond?

Readings on Consequentialism

Classics:

Bentham, Jeremy (1789) [An Introduction to the Principle of Morals and Legislation](#).

Mill, John Stuart (1863) [Utilitarianism](#).

See also:

Donner, Wendy (1998). Mill's utilitarianism. In John Skorupski (ed.), [The Cambridge Companion to Mill](#). Cambridge University Press. 255-292.

Crisp, Roger (1997) *Mill on Utilitarianism*, Routledge: London, chapters 5-7 (commentary).

Overviews:

Podcasts: [Brad Hooker on consequentialism](#)

[Phillip Pettit on consequentialism](#)

Frey, Raymond (2000) 'Act-Utilitarianism' in *The Blackwell Guide to Ethical Theory*, ed. H. LaFollette, Blackwell: Oxford.

Gensler, Harry (2011) *Ethics: A contemporary introduction*, Routledge 2011, chapter 10.

Haines, William (2006) '[Consequentialism](#)', *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.

Pettit, Philip (1991) '[Consequentialism](#)', in Peter Singer, ed., *A Companion to Ethics*, Oxford, Blackwell Publishers, pp. 230-37.

Sinnott-Armstrong, Walter (2003) '[Consequentialism](#)' *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.

Vallentyne, Peter (2007) 'Consequentialism' in *Ethics in Practice: An Anthology*, ed. H. LaFollette, (2007) Blackwell: Oxford.

Downloadable Papers:

Brink, David. '[Utilitarian Morality and the Personal Point of View](#)' *Journal of Philosophy* 83.8 (1986): 417-38.

Foot, Philippa (1985) '[Utilitarianism and the Virtues](#)', *Mind* vol. 94, pp.196-209.

Lenman, Jimmy (2000) '[Consequentialism and cluelessness](#)' *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 29 (4):342–370.

Lenman, Jimmy (2004). '[Utilitarianism and obviousness](#)'. *Utilitas* 16 (3):322-325.

Mason, Elinor (2004) '[Consequentialism and the principle of indifference](#)' *Utilitas* 16 (3):316-321.

Mason, Elinor (2009) '[What is Consequentialism](#)' *Think*, vol. 8, pp.19-28.

Nozick, Robert (1988). [Side Constraints](#). In Samuel Scheffler (ed.), *Consequentialism and its Critics*. Oxford University Press.

Pettit, Phillip (1988) '[The Consequentialist Can Recognise Rights](#)', *Philosophical Quarterly*, Vol. 35, pp. 537-51.

Railton, Peter (1984). '[Alienation, Consequentialism, and the Demands of Morality](#).' *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 13 (2):134-171.'

Smart, J. J. C (1978) '[Integrity and Squeamishness](#)', extract from his 'Utilitarianism and Justice', *Journal of Chinese Philosophy*

Thompson, Judith Jarvis, (1985) '[The Trolley Problem](#)' *The Yale Law Journal*, vol. 94 pp.1395-1415.

Books Available in the library.

Glover, Jonathan (ed.) (1990) *Utilitarianism and its Critics*, Macmillan, New York, parts 3, 5 and 6.

Scheffler, Samuel (1988) *Consequentialism and its Critics*, Oxford University Press: Oxford. In particular, see the introduction, essays 1 (Rawls), 2 (Williams), 3 (Nagel), 5 (Railton, above also), and 6 (Nozick, above also), (reprinted from his *The View From Nowhere*, ch. 9), Parfit and Scheffler.

Smart, J.J.C and Williams, Bernard (1973) *Utilitarianism For and Against*, Cambridge University Press: Cambridge, particularly, part 2, sections 2-5.

Williams, Bernard (1976) 'Utilitarianism and Moral Self-Indulgence' in his *Moral Luck*, Cambridge University Press, 1981, pp.40-53.

9) Well-Being

Required Tutorial Reading:

Nozick, Robert (1974) *Anarchy, State and Utopia*. Oxford: Blackwell, pp.42-45: "The Experience Machine" [Download from Blackboard]

Highly Recommended Non-Philosophical Reading

Extract from Aldous Huxley's 'Brave New World' Reprinted in *The Moral of the Story*, ed. P. Singer and R. Singer, Blackwell 2005.

Highly Recommended Philosophical Reading

Mill, John Stuart (1863) [Utilitarianism, chapter 2](#).

Suggested Further Reading:

Online materials (freely downloadable)

Podcast: [Thomas Hurka on Pleasure](#)

Baber, Harriet (2008). [The Experience Machine Deconstructed](#). *Philosophy in the Contemporary World* 15 (1):133-138.

Bentham, Jeremy (1789) [An Introduction to the Principle of Morals and Legislation, chapter 3 and 4](#).

Crisp, Roger (2001) '[Well-being](#)' *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*

Feldman, Fred (2002) '[The Good Life: A Defence of Attitudinal Hedonism](#)' *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 65:3, pp.604-628

Fletcher, Guy (2009) '[Rejecting Well-Being Invariabilism](#)' *Philosophical Papers* 38:1, pp.21-34

Hewitt, Sharon (2010). [What do our intuitions about the experience machine really tell us about hedonism?](#) *Philosophical Studies* 151 (3):331 - 349.

Tiberius, Valerie (2006) '[Well-Being: Psychological Research for Philosophers](#)' *Philosophy Compass* 1:5, pp.493-505

Books or papers from books (some copies available in the library)

Crisp, Roger (1997) *Mill on Utilitarianism*, Routledge: London, chapters 2 and 3.

Griffin, James (1986) *Well-Being, Its Meaning, Measurement and Moral Importance*, (Oxford University Press) chapters 1 and 2.

Nussbaum, Martha and Amartya Sen. [The quality of life](#). Oxford University Press, 1993.

Parfit, Derek (1984) *Reasons and Persons*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp.493-502: "Appendix I: What makes someone's life go best"

Tutorial Questions

- 1) Would you plug yourself into the experience machine? What of your loved ones?
- 2) Would you plug yourself in if your life was going really (a) badly? (b) well?
- 3) Is Nozick right to claim that we want to do things, rather than just think that we have been doing them?
- 4) Are people necessarily agents? Are we people at all if we merely passively receive experiences?
- 5) Is it too strong to claim that 'Plugging into the machine is a kind of suicide'? Justify your answer.
- 6) Are recreational drugs akin to experience machines?
- 7) Would you use a transformation machine to alter your character? Explain why/why not.

10) Moral Luck

Required Tutorial Reading:

Nagel, Thomas (1976) '[Moral Luck](#)' *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, supplementary vol. 50. Reprinted in Nagel's *Mortal Questions* (1979, Cambridge University Press), and Statman, D. (ed.) *Moral Luck*, (1993, Albany: State University of New York Press).

[The paper was originally published alongside another by Bernard Williams. You just need to read the Nagel]

Strongly Recommended Non-Philosophical Reading

Milgram, S. (1974) '[The Perils of Obedience](#)' *Harper's Magazine*.

Strongly Recommended Philosophical Reading

Williams, Bernard (1976) '[Moral Luck](#)' *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society*, supplementary vol. 1. Reprinted in Williams' *Moral Luck*, (1981, Cambridge University Press), and reprinted in Statman, D. (ed.) *Moral Luck*, (1993, Albany: State University of New York Press).

Suggested Further Reading:

Online materials (freely downloadable)

Podcast: [Fiery Cushman on Moral Luck](#)

Adams, Robert, M. (1985) '[Involuntary Sins](#)', *The Philosophical Review*, 94: 3-31.

Andre, Judith (1983) '[Nagel, Williams and Moral Luck](#)', *Analysis*, 43: 202-207; reprinted in Statman.

Browne, Brynmor (1992) '[A Solution to the Problem of Moral Luck](#)', *The Philosophical Quarterly*, 42: 343-356.

Coyne, Margaret Urban (1985) "[Moral luck?](#)" *The Journal of Value Inquiry* 19.4, pp. 319-325.

Hanna, Nathan (2012) '[Moral Luck Defended](#)' *Nous*, pp.1-17

Nelkin, Dana (2004) '[Moral Luck](#)' *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.

Rosebury, Brian (1995) '[Moral Responsibility and Moral Luck](#)', *The Philosophical Review*, 104: 499-524.

Ross, Sheryl, T. (2009), [Raising Responsibility: Motherhood and Moral Luck](#). *Hypatia*, 24: 56–69.

Monica Wong (2013) "[Moral Luck and the Condition of Control](#)." *Southwest Philosophy Review* 29.1: 99-106.

Zimmerman, Michael (2002) '[Taking Luck Seriously](#)', *The Journal of Philosophy*, 99: 553-576.

Books or papers from books (some copies available in the library)

Statman, Daniel (ed.) 1993 *Moral Luck*, New York Press.

Williams, Bernard (1981) *Moral Luck*, Cambridge University Press.

Tutorial Questions

- 1) Do you agree with Nagel's assessment when he writes, 'The view that moral luck is paradoxical is not a *mistake*, ethical or logical, but a perception of one of the ways in which the intuitively acceptable conditions of moral judgment threaten to undermine it all.' (p.27)?
- 2) According to Nagel, what kinds of moral luck are there? Do you think that they are all rightly so-called?
- 3) Adam Smith believed that, strictly speaking, we are only morally responsible for 'an inner act of pure will assessed by motive and intention' (p.31). Was he right?
- 4) Is Kant right to insist on the moral irrelevance of our temperament, or are we blameworthy for feelings such as pride, envy, vanity, etc.?
- 5) Is it permissible to judge people on the basis of what they would have done in different circumstances?
- 6) Why does Nagel say 'The area of genuine agency...seems to shrink...to an extensionless point.' (p.35)? Do you agree?
- 7) Is Nagel's claim that we have two irreconcilable perspectives – the internal and external view – convincing?

11) Naturalising Ethics: Moral Error Theory and Emotivism

Required Tutorial Reading:

Mackie, J. L. (1977) *Ethics: Inventing Right and Wrong*, chapter 1 'The Subjectivity of Values' Penguin Books. [Download from Blackboard]

Strongly Recommended Non-Philosophical Reading

Tadeusz Borowski 'This Way for the Gas, Ladies and Gentleman' in *The Moral of the Story*, ed. P. Singer and R. Singer, Blackwell 2005.

Strongly Recommended Philosophical Reading

Ayers, A. J. (1936) [Language Truth and Logic](#), Penguin Books, chapter 6.

Suggested Further Reading

Online materials (freely downloadable)

Podcast: [Susan Nieman on Philosophy in the 21st Century](#).

Brink, David (1984) '[Moral Realism and the sceptical arguments from disagreement and queerness](#)' *Australasian Journal of Philosophy*, vol. 62 pp.111-125.

Garner, R. T. (1990) '[On the genuine queerness of moral properties and facts](#)' *Australasian Journal of Philosophy*, vol. 68 pp.137-146.

Horowitz, Tamara. "[Philosophical Intuitions and Psychological Theory*](#)." *Ethics* 108.2 (1998): 367-385.

Joyce, Richard (2007) '[Moral Anti-Realism](#)' *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*

Loeb, Don (1998) '[Moral realism and the argument from disagreement](#)' *Philosophical Studies*, vol. 90 pp. 281-303.

Shafer-Landau, Russ (1994) '[Ethical disagreement, ethical objectivism and moral indeterminacy](#)' *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, vol. 54 pp.331-344.

Van Roojen, Mark (2009) '[Moral Cognitivism vs. Non-Cognitivism](#)' *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*

Books or papers from books (some copies available in the library)

Gensler, Harry (2011) *Ethics: A contemporary introduction*, Routledge 2011, chapter 5.

Harman, Gilbert (1997) *The Nature of Morality: An Introduction to Ethics*, chapters 1-4. OUP.

McNaughton, David (1995) *Moral Vision: An Introduction to Ethics*, chapters 1 and 2. Blackwell.

Tutorial Questions:

1. How does Mackie characterize his form of 'moral scepticism'? How is it distinguished from one use of 'moral subjectivism'?
2. Mackie places great emphasis on the distinction between conceptual and ontological questions. What is this distinction, and is Hare right to be sceptical regarding its viability?
3. Is Mackie right to claim that 'the objective appropriateness of standards in relation to aims' (p.27) could not threaten the subjectivity of value?
4. Mackie thinks that 'ordinary moral judgments include a claim to objectivity, an assumption that there are objective values' (p.35). Do you agree?
5. Do you think that 'the actual variations in the moral codes are more readily explained by the hypothesis that they reflect ways of life than by the hypothesis that they express perceptions...of objective values' (p.37)? Couldn't they be both?
6. 'If there were objective values, then they would have to be entities or qualities or relations of a very strange sort' (p.38). Why, according to Mackie, would they have to be so strange? Does this provide a convincing argument for the subjectivity of value?
7. Is an objectivist committed to there being a 'special faculty of moral perception' (p.38)?

8. SAMPLE EXAM PAPER (for guidance only)

Candidates must answer TWO questions.

- 1) 'The human practice of raising and killing animals for food causes unjustifiable suffering.' Discuss.
- 2) 'Punishment adds to the total amount of suffering in the world, so it is always wrong'. Discuss.
- 3) Is it better to be 'a human being dissatisfied than a pig satisfied' (Mill)?
- 4) What does our well-being consist of?
- 5) Do we have to be in control of our emotions to be responsible for them?
- 6) 'Real moral properties are unnecessary to explain any phenomenon, so they should not be postulated.' Discuss.

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

PHILOSOPHY

COURSE UNIT OUTLINE 2018-19

PHIL10041 Critical Thinking
Semester: 1 Credits: 20

This course guide should be read in conjunction with the *Philosophy Study Guide 2018-19*, available from the Philosophy Intranet.

- Lecturer(s):** Dr Graham Stevens
Office: 2.57 Humanities Bridgeford St.
Telephone: 0161 275 4886
Email: graham.p.stevens@manchester.ac.uk
Office Hours: Please email to arrange an appointment outside of these hours.
- Tutors:** Tutorials will be taken by Teaching Assistants – see below.
Their office hours will be posted here:
<https://www.socialsciences.manchester.ac.uk/student-intranet/undergraduate/your-programme/philosophy/contact-us/>
- Administrator:** Christopher Ashworth, UG Office, G.001 Arthur Lewis Building
Tel: 0161 275 7129, Email: christopher.ashworth@manchester.ac.uk
- Lectures:** Monday 10-11, Tuesday 12-1
- Tutorials:** Allocate yourself to a tutorial group using the Student System (this is compulsory and on a first come, first served basis)
- Assessment:** 1 Assessed Essay 1,500 words (33%); 1 Examination, 2hrs (67%)
- Reading Week:** Monday 29th October 2018 – Friday 2nd November 2018
- Philosophy Intranet:** <http://www.socialsciences.manchester.ac.uk/student-intranet/undergraduate/course-information/philosophy/>
Please go to the intranet for staff and TA office hours, the Philosophy Study Guide, and advice on accessing online philosophy resources.

*****IMPORTANT INFORMATION – PLEASE READ*****

Pre-requisite(s): None

Communication: *Students must read their University e-mails regularly, as important information will be communicated in this way.*

Examination period: Monday 14 January – Friday 25 January 2019
Re-sit Examination period: Monday 19th August – Friday 30th August 2019

Please read this course outline through very carefully as it provides essential information needed by all students attending this course

2. ABOUT THE COURSE

Summary

The course focuses on the nature, purpose, and evaluation of arguments. You will learn what arguments are and what they are for; also how to identify an argument in conversation or text, to identify and understand its structure, and to evaluate it. You will learn to distinguish between good and bad arguments, and to articulate what features of an argument make it good or bad, better or worse. You will learn how to apply these concepts to your essay writing.

You will also be introduced to some basic concepts that form the backbone of any academic discipline, such as: truth and falsity, rational and irrational beliefs, theory, method, proof and evidence.

Aims

The course aims to:

- Introduce students to basic principles of argument.
- Enhance their ability to understand the structure of and critically evaluate other people's arguments, and to formulate and clearly articulate arguments of their own.
- Enhance their ability to avoid common argumentative faults, such as ambiguity, irrelevance, fallacies, and rhetorical ploys.
- Enhance their understanding of key basic concepts, like theory, fact, truth, belief, proof, and evidence.

Learning Outcomes

On completion of this unit successful students will be able to:

- Identify and analyse the structure of arguments that appear in academic and non-academic texts, and in everyday conversation
- Evaluate arguments that is, judge whether (and in what sense) they are good or bad and articulate their reasons for that judgment.
- Spot common rhetorical ploys and avoid common fallacies.
- Plan an essay in such a way that it presents a thesis and has a clear argumentative structure.
- Distinguish between evidence and conclusive proof, between belief and truth, and between rational and irrational belief.
- Grasp the fundamentals of the language of symbolic logic.

3. COURSE ORGANISATION

Lectures: See Above

Tutorials:

DAY & TIME	LOCATION	TEACHING ASSISTANT
Monday 11-12pm	Crawford House_SEM RM A	J.Berskyte
Monday 12-1pm	Crawford House_SEM RM A	J.Berskyte
Monday 1-2pm	Crawford House_SEM RM A	J.Casey

Monday 2-3pm	Crawford House_SEM RM A	J.Casey
Monday 3-4pm	Crawford House_SEM RM A	C.Raineri
Monday 4-5pm	Crawford House_SEM RM A	C.Raineri
Tuesday 1-2pm	Simon_4.47	J.Lloyd
Tuesday 2-3pm	Simon_4.47	J.Lloyd
Weds 10-11am	Sam Alex_A18	S.Walgenbach
Weds 11-12pm	Sam Alex_A18	S.Walgenbach
Thursday 10-11am	Sam Alex_A18	S.Barnett
Thursday 11-12pm	Sam Alex_A18	S.Barnett
Thursday 1-2pm	Crawford House_SEM RM A	S.Barnett
Thursday 2-3pm	Crawford House_SEM RM A	J.Berskyte
Thursday 3-4pm	Crawford House_SEM RM A	J.Berskyte
Friday 10-11am	Crawford House_SEM RM A	J.Raab
Friday 11-12pm	Crawford House_SEM RM A	J.Raab
Friday 12-1pm	Crawford House_SEM RM A	J.Raab
Tuesday 3-4pm	Sam Alex_A18	J.Casey
Tuesday 4-5pm	Sam Alex_A18	J.Casey
Friday 3-4pm	Crawford House_SEM RM C	S.Walgenbach

Tutorials are weekly, starting in week 2. Attendance at tutorials is compulsory. It is students' responsibility to ensure that they have been allocated to a tutorial group. Students may not change group without permission.

Work and attendance

The work and attendance requirements for this course are that you:

- **Attend all tutorials**
If you are absent from a tutorial through illness you should inform your tutor and fill in a Certification of Student Ill Health (available from your department or from the SoSS UG Office; see your degree programme handbook for further details). If you are absent for another reason you should tell your tutor or the Philosophy Administrator, Chris Ashworth as soon as you can – if possible, *before* the tutorial.
- **Prepare adequately for tutorials**
You will be set preparatory work for tutorials; see the study budget below for a guide to roughly how long you should spend on this.
- **Complete written work on time**
Failure to complete assessed work by the due date constitutes a violation of the work and attendance requirement.

Violations of work and attendance requirements will be reported to your Programme Director. If you have difficulties (e.g. personal, financial or family problems) that result in persistent failure to meet the work and attendance requirements, you should talk to your Programme Director or Academic Advisor.

Texts recommended for purchase:

Critical Thinking: A Concise Guide, Tracy Bowell and Gary Kemp, London: Routledge, 2002 [4th edition if possible but any edition will suffice].

Essentials of Symbolic Logic, R.L. Simpson, London: Broadview, 2008.

No text *must* be purchased. Tutorial readings will be made available via Blackboard, and recommended texts are available through the library and (in many cases) web. However, since demand for library books is likely to be high, students may find it useful to buy the above texts.

Course materials: Further materials will be made available on the courses Blackboard site. Log-in to Blackboard via My Manchester at: <https://online.manchester.ac.uk>

Study skills and online resources

The Philosophy intranet site, has lots of useful information and advice on, for example, essay-writing and accessing e-journals and other online resources. It includes an 'essay bank' containing a couple of actual student essays with lots of comments on them. You can also download the **Philosophy Study Guide**, find out about staff and TA contact details, etc.

Study budget

The University's Academic Standards Code of Practice specifies that a 20 credit course is expected to require about 200 hours work by students. For this course, you are recommended to break this down roughly as follows:

Lectures	10 x 2 = 20 hours
Tutorials	10 hours
Tutorial preparation	10 x 5 hours = 50 hours
Essay preparation	40 hours
Exam preparation	80 hours

TOTAL: 200 hours

Prompt arrival at classes

Students should note that all lectures and tutorials start **on the hour** and should end at 50 minutes past the hour. Late arrival for tutorials may result in your being marked absent; if you arrive late it is your responsibility to ensure that your tutor has marked you as present.

4. ASSESSMENT

Assessment Criteria

For the assessment criteria for PHIL course units, see the *Philosophy Study Guide* (available online at: <http://www.socialsciences.manchester.ac.uk/student-intranet/undergraduate/course-information/philosophy/study-resources/>) which also provides further guidance concerning the assessment criteria.

EXAMINATION

One two-hour exam will be set at the end of semester one, in which you must answer two questions. This provides two thirds of your assessment for the course. You will not be able to reproduce material from your assessed essay in your exam.

Past Exam Papers can be found on the Blackboard site for this course.

ASSESSED ESSAYS

One essay of 1,500 words (titles will be released via Blackboard) which provides one third of your assessment for this course.

The word limit includes footnotes but **excludes** the bibliography.

Students must state the word count at the end of the essay – failure to do so will result in a deduction of 2 marks.

If an essay goes over the word limit by 10% or more, 5 marks will be deducted.

Presentation

Essays must be typed in at least 12 point in a readable font, and should be **double spaced**. They should include proper bibliography and references.

When submitting electronically the title of the file you upload should be your student ID number followed by the question number. All essays are marked anonymously; please do not put your name on the filename or anywhere in the essay.

Bibliography and Referencing

The lack of a proper bibliography and appropriate references (citations) will potentially greatly affect the mark for the work and may be considered plagiarism.

For full guidance on how to refer to works you are citing and paraphrasing in your essay, and how to write a bibliography, is provided in Chapter 5 of the *Philosophy Study Guide*. **You MUST follow this guidance.** Bibliography and referencing conventions can vary from discipline to discipline, and the conventions in Philosophy may differ from those employed in other subjects you are studying.

Plagiarism

Plagiarism is a form of academic malpractice that can result in serious penalties, including deduction of marks, the award of a mark of 0, and – in the most serious cases – exclusion from the University. There is also philosophy-specific guidance on plagiarism (and how to avoid plagiarising accidentally) in Chapter 5 of the *Philosophy Study Guide*.

Students should also consult the University's statement on plagiarism, which can be obtained from the School of Social Sciences student intranet..

Submitting your essay

PHIL10041 uses online submission and marking only.

You must submit your essay electronically to 'Turnitin' via Blackboard. Further instructions on this are available on the Blackboard site for the course, see: <https://online.manchester.ac.uk>

When submitting electronically the title of your essay (i.e. the filename) should be your student ID number, followed by the question number, i.e. xxxxxx Qy.

Failure to submit an electronic copy of your essay will result in a mark of zero.

Deadline

The submission date for the assessed essay is **21/11/17**. All essays should be submitted **by 2pm** on the hand in day.

See the *Philosophy Study Guide* for information about the granting of extensions and penalties for unexcused late submission and for overlong essays.

Penalties for late submission of essays

Essays submitted after 2.00pm carry the following day's date.

Please see the Policy on the Submission of Work for Summative Assessment in relation to the institutional sliding scale for penalties relating to late submission of work (<http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/display.aspx?DocID=24561>).

Please note particularly point 4.7 *The mark awarded will reduce by 10 marks per day for 5 days (assuming a 0 -100 marking scale), after which a mark of zero will be awarded.*

Students who have a valid reason (*i.e.* mitigating circumstances with the necessary documentation) for not being able to submit their assessed essay on time should collect a mitigating circumstances form from the SoSS Undergraduate Office (Arthur Lewis Building, G.001), which should be completed and returned to G.001.

Accessing feedback for essays using online marking

Feedback on your assessed essay will be available on Blackboard no later than 15 working days after the essay deadline date (provided the essay is submitted on time).

To access the feedback please log into My Manchester and go to the **Blackboard** site for PHIL10041. Navigate to the **Submission of Coursework folder** and then click on and follow the instructions under: **'How to download your feedback from Turn it in'**

Please note that all essay marks are provisional until confirmed by the external examiner and the final examinations boards in June.

Students are welcome to discuss their essay with the course convenor during their office hours.

Feedback

The School of Social Sciences (SoSS) is committed to providing timely and appropriate feedback to students on their academic progress and achievement, thereby enabling students to reflect on their progress and plan their academic and skills development effectively. Students are reminded that feedback is necessarily *responsive*: only when a student has done a certain amount of work and approaches us with it at the appropriate fora is it possible for us to feed *back* on the *student's work*. The main forms of feedback on this course are written feedback responses to assessed essays and exam answers.

We also draw your attention to the variety of generic forms of feedback available to you on this as on all SoSS courses. These include: meeting the lecturer/tutor during their office hours; e-mailing questions to the lecturer/tutor; asking questions from the lecturer (before and after lecture); presenting a question on the discussion board on Blackboard; and obtaining feedback from your peers during tutorials.

5. COURSE OUTLINE

Week 1	The Structure of Arguments
Week 2	Validity
Week 3	Arguments in Philosophy
Week 4	Writing Philosophy Essays
Week 5	Failures of Reason
Week 6	READING WEEK – no classes
Week 7	Logic 1: Sentence Connectives
Week 8	Logic 2: Translation
Week 9	Logic 3: Truth-tables
Week 10	Logic 4: Predicates and Relations
Week 11	Logic 5: Quantification
Week 12	Revision and Exam Preparation

6. READING LIST

None apart from those listed above and tutorials readings to be provided as required.

8. SAMPLE EXAM PAPER (for guidance only)

1. Define the following: 12 marks
 - a. Deductive validity
 - b. Conditional degree of rational expectation
 - c. Inductive soundness
 - d. Proposition

2. Is it possible for a deductively valid argument to have false premises and a true conclusion? If it is, then provide an example of such an argument. 8 marks

3. What is the principle of induction and can it be justified? Explain your answer. 12 marks

4. What, if anything, is wrong with the following arguments? 12 marks

- a. It is quite probable that Shakespeare plagiarised the work of Ben Johnson. A common motif of Shakespearean tragedy is the idea of the flawed hero whose minor character flaws grow larger under external pressure, like a hairline fracture in bone that slowly but surely widens when subject to the right kind of force. This motif appears in nearly all of Johnson's tragedies.
- b. The University of Manchester claims that its animal testing programme is necessary for the development of medical science. Rubbish! Just look at how much money they stand to make from the whole business!
- c. She says that she loves me and she must be telling the truth, because no-one lies to one that they love.
- d. If you needed firm evidence of the health benefits of adopting the Christian faith, look no further than Cliff Richard. This man, who has been a devoted Christian for many years, looks better than some people half his age!
5. Translate the following into propositional logic: 24 marks
- a. Mary and John will eat their vegetables only if Harry cooks cauliflower.
- b. If the computer doesn't work then the printer won't either but the television will work if it isn't broken.
- c. Unless Mary meets John, she will not see him.
- d. Mary and John, or Luke and Jane, or Lucy but not Harry, will go for a run.
- e. If Rod is an Emu then Rod is a bird that cannot fly
- f. Plato is a rational animal just in case he is a human.
- g. Unless we stop using fossil fuels, the planet will get warmer.
- h. Unless we stop using fossil fuels, the planet will get warmer, although some people still profit from the sale of fossil fuels
6. Each of the following sentences is ambiguous. For each one, provide two distinct propositions that they could mean, and say whether the ambiguity is syntactic or lexical. 8 marks
- a. John and Mary will not eat their vegetables if Harry cuts them into small pieces.
- b. Cliff Richard dropped his new guitar on his foot and broke it.
- c. Every song that Cliff Richard writes is about something that is dear to him.
- d. Yesterday, I read a very interesting book about crime in Manchester.
7. Translate the following into predicate logic: 24 marks
- a. John loves Mary but no-one loves John.
- b. Every exam contains at least one difficult question.
- c. Every book written by Russell is longer than some book written by Wittgenstein.
- d. Some people read books even though they dislike some of them.

- e. Everyone loves some, but not necessarily same, person.
- f. Someone, namely Frank, is loved by everyone
- g. Nothing is greater than something that is perfect.
- h. Everything is bigger than something and nothing is bigger than everything.

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

PHILOSOPHY

COURSE UNIT OUTLINE 2018-19

<p style="text-align: center;">PHIL10402 Semester: 2 Credits: 20</p>

This course guide should be read in conjunction with the *Philosophy Study Guide 2017-18*, available from the Philosophy Intranet.

Lecturer(s):	Dr Paula Satne
Office:	Humanities Bridgeford Street, 2 nd floor, room 2.45
Telephone:	0161 275 4777
Email:	paula.satne@manchester.ac.uk
Office Hours:	Monday 15.15 to 16.15hs Tuesday 11.30 to 12.30hs Please email to arrange an appointment if you want to see me in my office hours.
Tutors:	Tutorials will be taken by Teaching Assistants: Lucy Tomlinson (lucy.tomlinson@manchester.ac.uk), Leonie Smith (l.smith@manchester.ac.uk) and William Knowles (william. knowles@manchester.ac.uk) Their office hours will be posted here: http://www.socialsciences.manchester.ac.uk/student-intranet/undergraduate/course-information/philosophy/office-hours/
Administrator:	Christopher Ashworth, UG Office, G.001 Arthur Lewis Building Tel: 0161 275 7129, Email: christopher.ashworth@manchester.ac.uk
Lectures:	Wednesday 11-1, Kilburn TH 1.5
Tutorials:	Allocate yourself to a tutorial group using the Student System (this is compulsory and on a first come, first served basis)
Assessment:	1'500 word essay 33% 2 hour exam 67%
Easter Break:	Monday 8 th April 2019 – Friday 26 th April 2019
Philosophy Intranet:	http://www.socialsciences.manchester.ac.uk/student-intranet/undergraduate/course-information/philosophy/ Please go to the intranet for staff and TA office hours, the Philosophy Study Guide, and advice on accessing online philosophy resources.

*****IMPORTANT INFORMATION – PLEASE READ*****

Pre-requisite(s): None

Communication: <i>Students must read their University e-mails regularly, as important information will be communicated in this way.</i>
--

Examination period: Wednesday 15 May – Wednesday 5 June 2019

Re-sit Examination period: Monday 19th August – Friday 30th August 2019

Please read this course outline through very carefully as it provides essential information needed by all students attending this course

2. ABOUT THE COURSE

Summary

The course unit will cover a variety of philosophical figures and texts from the ancient to the early modern period, from both Western and non-Western traditions, focusing on Plato and Aristotle from 4th /5th Century BC Greece; the Islamic philosophers Avicenna and Al-Kindi from the middle ages; and, from 17th/18th -Century Europe, Descartes, Elizabeth of Bohemia, Spinoza and Leibniz – drawing connections between them, and bringing other philosophers from history to bear on the issues, where appropriate. All texts are read in translation, and no knowledge of languages other than English is either assumed or required.

Aims

The unit aims both to introduce students to the history of philosophy, and to foster the skills of close scrutiny and interpretation of philosophical texts, reading translated texts not originally written in contemporary English.

Learning Outcomes

Students should acquire each of the following:

Knowledge and Understanding: Students should acquire knowledge of some key philosophical figures and texts from Ancient Greece to the early modern period, and understanding of some of their philosophical positions and arguments. They should also acquire understanding of how a philosophical text can be interpreted in different ways.

Intellectual skills: Skills in close reading of philosophical texts (many not written in contemporary English style) and adjudicating between rival interpretations.

Practical skills: skills in time-management, in independent working, and in developing motivation and personal initiative.

Transferable skills and personal qualities: The course unit should increase students' skills in understanding difficult material, critical analysis, and assessing and formulating arguments.

3. COURSE ORGANISATION

Lectures: Wednesday 11-1, Kilburn TH 1.5

Tutorials:

DAY & TIME	LOCATION	TEACHING ASSISTANT
Monday 11-12pm	Sam Alex_A18	L. Tomlinson
Monday 12-1pm	Sam Alex_A18	L. Tomlinson
Tuesday 12-1pm	Sam Alex_A18	W. Knowles
Tuesday 1-2pm	Sam Alex_A18	L. Tomlinson
Wed 10-11am	Simon_5.08	L. Smith
Tue 1-2pm	Uni Place 5.204	W. Knowles
Wed 9-10am	Sam Alex_A18	L. Smith
Thu 4-5pm	Sam Alex_A114	L. Smith

Tutorials are weekly, starting in **week 2**. Attendance at tutorials is compulsory. It is students' responsibility to ensure that they have been allocated to a tutorial group. Students may not change group without permission.

Work and attendance

The work and attendance requirements for this course are that you:

- **Attend all tutorials**
If you are absent from a tutorial through illness you should inform your tutor and fill in a Certification of Student Ill Health (available from your department or from the SoSS UG Office; see your degree programme handbook for further details). If you are absent for another reason you should tell your tutor or the Philosophy Administrator, Chris Ashworth as soon as you can – if possible, *before* the tutorial.
- **Prepare adequately for tutorials**
You will be set preparatory work for tutorials; see the study budget below for a guide to roughly how long you should spend on this.
- **Complete written work on time**
Failure to complete assessed work by the due date constitutes a violation of the work and attendance requirement.

Violations of work and attendance requirements will be reported to your Programme Director. If you have difficulties (e.g. personal, financial or family problems) that result in persistent failure to meet the work and attendance requirements, you should talk to your Programme Director or Academic Advisor.

Texts recommended for purchase:

No text must be purchased. Tutorial readings will be made available via Blackboard, and recommended texts are available through the library and (in many cases) web.

Course materials: Further materials will be made available on the courses Blackboard site. Log-in to Blackboard via My Manchester at: <https://online.manchester.ac.uk>

Study skills and online resources

The Philosophy intranet site, has lots of useful information and advice on, for example, essay-writing and accessing e-journals and other online resources. It includes an 'essay bank' containing a couple of actual student essays with lots of comments on them. You can also download the **Philosophy Study Guide**, find out about staff and TA contact details, etc.

Study budget

The University's Academic Standards Code of Practice specifies that a 20 credit course is expected to require about 200 hours work by students. For this course, you are recommended to break this down roughly as follows:

Lectures	11 x 2 = 22 hours
Tutorials	10 hours
Tutorial preparation	10 x 4.5 hours = 45 hours
Weekly additional reading	10 x 2.5 hours = 25 hours
Essay preparation	40 hours
Exam preparation	58 hours
TOTAL:	200 hours

A note on preparation for tutorials

'Preparation' means: Read the set text – properly (not just the bits that the questions are about!) – and answer the questions on it (both available on Blackboard). Note that **four and a half hours a week** are allocated to preparation for tutorials.

You must bring your WRITTEN answers to all the questions, and the set text itself, to the tutorial – either printed out or on a tablet/laptop (NOT on a phone).

In addition, two and a half hours a week have been allocated to additional reading. This is your opportunity to read up on background material such as relevant textbooks or *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* entries; to read more by the authors we'll be studying; to listen to one of the podcasts on the Blackboard site (click 'Podcasts' on the left); or to do some preliminary searching for, and skim-reading of, additional texts that you might discuss in your essay or the exam.

Prompt arrival at classes

Students should note that all lectures and tutorials start **on the hour** and should end at 50 minutes past the hour. Late arrival for tutorials may result in your being marked absent; if you arrive late it is your responsibility to ensure that your tutor has marked you as present.

4. ASSESSMENT

Assessment Criteria

For the assessment criteria for PHIL course units, see the *Philosophy Study Guide* (available online at: <http://www.socialsciences.manchester.ac.uk/student-intranet/undergraduate/course-information/philosophy/study-resources/>) which also provides further guidance concerning the assessment criteria.

EXAMINATION

One two-hour exam will be set at the end of semester one, in which you must answer two questions, taken from weeks 6-11 of the course (Islamic philosophy/Descartes/Elizabeth of Bohemia, Spinoza and Leibniz). This provides 67% of your assessment for the course.

I will provide a sample exam paper from a previous year in the exam revision lecture. The format of the exam will be the same as the sample exam, but roughly speaking you should expect to have

to answer a question on Islamic philosophy and a question on Descartes/ Elisabeth of Bohemia / Spinoza or Leibniz.

ASSESSED ESSAYS

One essay of 1,500 words (titles listed below) which provides one third of your assessment for this course.

The word limit includes footnotes but **excludes** the bibliography.

Students must state the word count at the end of the essay – failure to do so will result in a deduction of 2 marks.

If an essay goes over the word limit by 10% or more, 5 marks will be deducted.

Presentation

Essays must be typed in at least 12 point in a readable font, and should be **double spaced**. They should include proper bibliography and references.

When submitting electronically the title of the file you upload should be your student ID number followed by the question number. All essays are marked anonymously; please do not put your name on the filename or anywhere in the essay.

Bibliography and Referencing

The lack of a proper bibliography and appropriate references (citations) will potentially greatly affect the mark for the work and may be considered plagiarism.

For full guidance on how to refer to works you are citing and paraphrasing in your essay, and how to write a bibliography, is provided in Chapter 5 of the Philosophy Study Guide. **You MUST follow this guidance.** Bibliography and referencing conventions can vary from discipline to discipline, and the conventions in Philosophy may differ from those employed in other subjects you are studying.

Plagiarism

Plagiarism is a form of academic malpractice that can result in serious penalties, including deduction of marks, the award of a mark of 0, and – in the most serious cases – exclusion from the University. There is also philosophy-specific guidance on plagiarism (and how to avoid plagiarizing accidentally) in Chapter 5 of the Philosophy Study Guide.

Students should also consult the University's statement on plagiarism, which can be obtained from the School of Social Sciences student intranet..

Submitting your essay

This module uses online submission and marking only.

You must submit your essay electronically to 'Turnitin' via Blackboard. Further instructions on this are available on the Blackboard site for the course, see: <https://online.manchester.ac.uk>

When submitting electronically the title of your essay (i.e. the filename) should be your student ID number, followed by the question number, i.e. xxxxxx Qy.

Failure to submit an electronic copy of your essay will result in a mark of zero.

Deadline

The submission date for the assessed essay is **Tuesday 12 March 2019**. All essays should be submitted **by 2pm** on the hand in day.

See the *Philosophy Study Guide* for information about the granting of extensions and penalties for unexcused late submission and for overlong essays.

Penalties for late submission of essays

Essays submitted after 2.00pm carry the following day's date.

Please see the Policy on the Submission of Work for Summative Assessment in relation to the institutional sliding scale for penalties relating to late submission of work (<http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/display.aspx?DocID=24561>).

Please note particularly point 4.7 *The mark awarded will reduce by 10 marks per day for 5 days (assuming a 0 -100 marking scale), after which a mark of zero will be awarded.*

Students who have a valid reason (*i.e.* mitigating circumstances with the necessary documentation) for not being able to submit their assessed essay on time should collect a mitigating circumstances form from the SoSS Undergraduate Office (Arthur Lewis Building, G.001), which should be completed and returned to G.001.

Accessing feedback for essays using online marking

Feedback on your assessed essay will be available on Blackboard no later than 15 working days after the essay deadline date (provided the essay is submitted on time).

To access the feedback please log into My Manchester and go to the **Blackboard** site for this module. Navigate to the **Submission of Coursework folder** and then click on and follow the instructions under: '**How to download your feedback from Turn it in**'

Please note that all essay marks are provisional until confirmed by the external examiner and the final examinations boards in June.

Students are welcome to discuss their essay with the course convenor during their office hours.

Feedback

The School of Social Sciences (SoSS) is committed to providing timely and appropriate feedback to students on their academic progress and achievement, thereby enabling students to reflect on their progress and plan their academic and skills development effectively. Students are reminded that feedback is necessarily *responsive*: only when a student has done a certain amount of work and approaches us with it at the appropriate fora is it possible for us to feed *back* on the *student's work*. The main forms of feedback on this course are written feedback responses to assessed essays and exam answers.

We also draw your attention to the variety of generic forms of feedback available to you on this as on all SoSS courses. These include: meeting the lecturer/tutor during their office hours; e-mailing questions to the lecturer/tutor; asking questions from the lecturer (before and after lecture); presenting a question on the discussion board on Blackboard; and obtaining feedback from your peers during tutorials.

Assessed Essay Titles

1. What, According to Plato's Allegory of the Cave, should be the role of the philosopher in the ideal city? How convincing is Plato's suggestion?
2. How convincing is Plato's solution to Meno's paradox?
3. Explain and evaluate Aristotle's conception of substance.
4. According to Aristotle, what is the happiest life for a human being? Should we agree with him?

Please note that you should not simply rely on secondary sources for your essay; you must demonstrate close reading of, and engagement with relevant primary sources.

You are strongly encouraged to discuss your essay plan with your tutor or the course convenor in advance of writing your essay. We will consider essay plans at any time up to one week before the essay (Your essay deadline is on the 12th March 2019). We will dedicate the second part of lecture 6 to provide advice on essay planning and writing. If you are still struggling to decide what to write about, or are stuck on anything or want to talk things through, please come and talk to the course convenor or your tutor in our office hours– or get in touch by email if you can't make those times.

5. COURSE OUTLINE

See §3 above for information about what preparation you should be doing for the tutorials, and §6 below for how to access the tutorial texts and questions.

Week	Date of lecture	Lecture topic	Tutorial text
1/2	30 Jan	Organisation and brief introduction to the history of philosophy and the presocratics	Very short introduction to the Presocratics: Irwin, T. <i>Classical Philosophy</i> (OUP), pp. 38-45.
2/3	6 Feb	Plato's Theory of Forms	Plato, <i>Republic</i> , 502d-521b Plato, <i>Symposium</i> , 210-212
3/4	13 Feb	Plato's epistemology, the theory of recollection and the immortality of soul	Plato, <i>Meno</i> .
4/5	20 Feb	Aristotle's metaphysics (general introduction)	Cohen, S. Marc, "Aristotle's Metaphysics" in <i>The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy</i> .
5/6	27 Feb	Aristotle's on happiness and the human soul	Aristotle, <i>Nicomachean Ethics</i> , Book I and Book X. sections 6-8.
6/7	6 March	Islamic philosophy I: Avicenna on the Human Soul (first part) and advice on essay writing (second part)	Avicenna: Selections from 'Psychology' from <i>The Cure</i>
7/8	13 March	Islamic philosophy: Al Kindi on Human Happiness	Selections from <i>On the Means of Dispelling Sorrows</i> and Peter Adamson's <i>Philosophy Bites</i> podcast (available on BB)
8/9	20 March	Descartes: Method of Doubt and the <i>cogito</i>	<i>Meditations</i> , I & II
9/10	27 March	On Descartes' dualism	<i>Meditations</i> , VI and Selected

		and Elisabeth of Bohemia's problem of interaction	correspondence between Descartes and Princess Elisabeth of Bohemia
10/11	3 April	Spinoza's and Leibniz's solutions to the Problem of Interaction	John Cottingham, <i>The Rationalists</i> , Chapter 4.
		EASTER BREAK	
11/12	1 st May	Exam revision lecture	No tutorial

6. READING LIST AND RESOURCES

6. 1 RESOURCES

Do I need to buy any books?

The short answer is 'no'. All the set tutorial texts will be available on Blackboard at least one week before the tutorial, and there are very many journal articles, encyclopedia entries and books available online. (Also, one advantage of studying the history of philosophy is that all of the original texts are out of copyright so freely available on the internet.) There is no *essential* reading that you will even need to physically get out of the library, let alone buy. However:

1. The main primary texts we'll be looking at are the following, any or all of which would be a great start or addition to your own philosophical library:

Plato: *Republic, Meno*

Aristotle: *Nicomachean Ethics* (often just referred to as the *Ethics*)

Descartes: *Meditations on First Philosophy*

Spinoza, *Ethics*

Leibniz, *Monadology*

Most available cheaply (very cheaply if you buy second-hand online) in the Penguin Classics series, and there should be some copies in Blackwell's on campus.

(*Meno* is in *Protagoras and Meno*.) Other editions recommended in the reading week.

For both Plato and Aristotle it is **very** useful to have an edition (e.g. the Penguin Classics edition) that includes the marginal numbers. This is a standard way of dividing the works of these philosophers, and references to the works of Plato and Aristotle in textbooks and commentaries will normally be given in terms of these numbers.

You can download all five volumes of Plato's dialogues (trans. Jowett), with marginal numbers, from oll.libertyfund.org/titles/plato-the-dialogues-of-plato-in-5-vols-jowett-ed – select the volume and scroll down the page till you get to the blue 'Available in the following formats' box. You may be able to find similar for Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*.

There are lots of other versions available online but many lack the marginal numbers. To some extent you can compensate for this by the greater ease with which electronic versions of the texts can be searched, but this is an imperfect replacement since different translations will – obviously – use different words. In your essays you should provide marginal numbers is preferable.

2. There will be no sweeping overviews of the history of philosophy in this course; we will mainly be focussing on a relatively small range of authors, texts and philosophical issues. If you want a general overview of the whole of the history of Western Philosophy, a good recent book is this one:

Kenny, Anthony (1998) *A Brief History of Western Philosophy* (Oxford: Blackwell)

Or its much longer cousin, in four volumes:

Kenny, Anthony (2012) *A New History of Western Philosophy, in Four Parts* (Oxford: Clarendon Press)

You might also buy (again, pretty cheaply – and again there should be some copies in Blackwell's) one of the several relevant books in OUP's *Very Short Introductions* series. There are books in this series on Ancient Philosophy (by Julia Annas), Plato (Julia Annas again), Aristotle (Jonathan Barnes), Philosophy in the Islamic World (Peter Adamson), and Descartes (Tom Sorell).

If at any point you have trouble finding texts you want to read just email the course convenor or your tutor and we'll see what we can do.

Available from the course Blackboard site:

Log in to Blackboard via My Manchester at: <https://online.manchester.ac.uk>

Set texts: The set texts and accompanying questions are all on the 'Course content' section of the Blackboard site. You **must bring both the set text and your answers to the tutorial questions** (either in hard copy or on a laptop/tablet – no mobile phones please). You will save on printing costs and destroy fewer trees if you figure out how to print 2 sides to a

page!

Study skills resources: Please see the 'Learning resources' page of the Blackboard site for an essay checklist and links to other study skills and essay-writing resources, many of which are philosophy-specific (including our *Philosophy Study Guide 2018-19*).

Handouts and presentations: For most of the lectures, there will be PowerPoint presentations. You can download these from the 'Course content' section of the Blackboard site – they will normally be up just before the lecture. Occasionally, I will also provide handouts or lecture exercises.

Some notes on the reading list and other sources:

Online journal articles: Most of the journal articles on the reading list are available online through the university library's subscription. It's not always that easy to figure out how to access them; for some guidance please go to the philosophy UG intranet site and click on Study resources > Online resources. (Way the easiest thing to do is set up a VPN on your own computer.)

E-books: Quite a few of the books listed are available online through the University library website. Again, setting up a VPN makes it much easier to access these off-campus. In addition, you can often see at least some of the book (which will at least give you an idea of whether it would be useful to read it) via Google Books (books.google.co.uk).

Availability of texts: The library stock will not be able to cope with large numbers of students going after the same book at the same time, so please plan ahead. Please do let PS know **a.s.a.p.** if there are books that never seem to be available; I might be able to do something about it, e.g. by moving more copies into High Demand.

Primary sources and textbooks: Primary sources are generally pieces of original philosophical research which argue for a particular view. In the history of philosophy, primary sources include not only the original material (i.e. by Plato, Descartes, etc.) but more recent commentaries, journal articles and books.

Textbooks (including encyclopedia entries) generally provide a reasonably balanced overview of the topic, laying out the various views and highlighting their strengths and weaknesses.

Textbooks are a good way of getting interested in the topic or finding your way around the territory. However, **you should not rely exclusively on textbooks** in preparing for either the essay or the exam. In particular, if you are talking about the view or argument of

philosopher X, you should always actually read X's work and not rely on someone else's textbook/encyclopedia entry description of it. This is particularly important in the history of philosophy. Partly this is because different people disagree about how to interpret the original source material; but partly it's because one of the skills you're supposed to be mastering is that of being able to read and come to some understanding, on your own, of the original texts. So this is a skill you should aim to demonstrate in your assessed work. Bear in mind, however, that the distinction between primary sources and textbooks is not a sharp one: plenty of 'textbooks' are pretty opinionated, and plenty of primary sources provide at least some balanced exposition of different views. Generally a book that calls itself a 'guide' or 'introduction' or 'handbook' or is obviously aimed at an undergraduate audience will fall more into the 'textbooks' than the 'primary sources' category.

How to use the reading list: Some of the texts listed will be referred to in the lectures, but a lot won't. They're just things that you might find useful. You are not expected to read everything on the list; nor are you discouraged from reading (and talking about in your essay or the exam) other things, with the caveat that you should only refer to decent sources (e.g. not the uncensored internet musings of amateur philosophers). There are of course lots and lots of books and journal articles on the relevant bits of the history of philosophy that are not listed here; if you do want to explore a particular topic or find out what has been written in response to specific books or articles, use Google Scholar or Phil Papers. (And set up a VPN first if you're off-campus! See above. You'll be able to access the texts much more easily.)

6.2 READING LIST

Books marked with a * are available as eBooks from the University library. All books listed are available from the library, in hard copy or as eBooks or both. Texts marked a ** are highly recommended. *** means that the book is available as eBook and that I highly recommend it.

Presentation/Handouts from the lectures may contain additional items

Lecture 1: General introductions to the Presocratics

Tutorial 1 (week 2) reading: Irwin, T. <i>Classical Philosophy</i> (OUP), pp. 38-45.

Curd, Patricia (2014), 'Presocratic philosophy', *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Summer 2014 Edition), E. N. Zalta (ed.), plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2014/entries/presocratics/

Kenny 1998 (see above), Ch.1

Osborne, Catherine (2004) *Presocratic Philosophy: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: OUP)

General introduction to ancient philosophy

Annas, Julia (2000) *Ancient Philosophy: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: OUP).
Kenny 1998, Chs.1 & 2

Plato: general

**Annas, Julia (1981) *An Introduction to Plato's Republic* (Oxford: Clarendon)

-- (2003) *Plato: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: OUP)

*Fine, Gail (ed.) (2008) *The Oxford Handbook of Plato* (Oxford: OUP)

Kenny 1998, Chs.2 & 3

*Kraut, Richard (ed.) (1992) *The Cambridge Companion to Plato* (Cambridge: CUP)

Kraut, R. (2014) 'Plato', *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Summer 2014 Edition), E. N. Zalta (ed.), plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2014/entries/plato/

Melling, David (1987) *Understanding Plato* (Oxford: OUP)

Lecture 2: Plato Theory of Forms (*Republic*)

Tutorial 2 (week 3): Plato, *Republic*, 502d-521b

Plato, *Symposium*, 210-212

**Annas, Julia (1981) *An Introduction to Plato's Republic* (Oxford: Clarendon), Ch. 9 and ch. 10.

**Fine, Gail (2003) *Plato on Knowledge and Forms: Selected Essays* (Oxford: Clarendon)

Kenny (1998) Ch.3 (sections on Theory of Ideas and *Republic*)

**Kraut, Richard (1997) (ed.) *Plato's Republic* (Rowman & Littlefield), Ch. 9

**Melling, David (1987) *Understanding Plato* (OUP), Ch. 10.

**Murdoch, I. (1997) 'The Fire and the Sun: Why Plato Banished the Artists' in *Existentialists and Mystics*, Chatto & Windus, London.

Nehamas, Alexander (1999) *Virtues of Authenticity: Essays on Plato and Socrates* (Princeton: Princeton University Press), Ch.7

Pappas, Nickolas (1995) *Routledge Philosophy Guide to Plato and the Republic* (Routledge)

Santas, Gerasimos (ed.) (2006) *The Blackwell Guide to Plato's Republic* (Oxford: Blackwell)

Voegelin, Eric (2000), *Plato*, (University of Missouri Press), Ch 3.

Lecture 3: Plato Meno's paradox, the theory of recollection and the immortality of the soul (*Meno*)

Tutorial 3 (week 4): Plato, *Meno*.

** Plato, (2011) *Phaedo in Meno and Phaedo*, ed. by David Sedley and Alex Long (CUP) (other editions also available)

**Day, Jane M. (ed.) (1994) *Plato's Meno in Focus* (London: Routledge)

**Fine, Gail (2003) *Plato on Knowledge and Forms: Selected Essays* (Oxford: Clarendon)

Fraser, Edward (2012) 'Picking a fight with Plato', *Philosophy Now*, https://philosophynow.org/issues/90/Picking_A_Fight_With_Plato

**Melling, David (1987) *Understanding Plato* (OUP), Ch. 6 and 7

Nehamas, Alexander (1999) *Virtues of Authenticity: Essays on Plato and Socrates* (Princeton: Princeton University Press), Ch.1

White, Nicholas (1976) *Plato on Knowledge and Reality* (Indianapolis: Hackett)

Lecture 4: Aristotle General Introduction to his metaphysics (substance)

Tutorial 4 (week 5): Cohen, S. Marc, "Aristotle's Metaphysics", <i>The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy</i> .

Ackrill, J.L. (1981) *Aristotle the Philosopher* (OUP), Ch. 2, 3 and 9.

Aristotle, *Categories*, Chapters 1-5. (various editions)

Aristotle, *Metaphysics*, Book VII (various editions)

Barnes, Jonathan, *Aristotle: A Very Short Introduction* (OUP)

Cohen, S. Marc, "Aristotle's Metaphysics", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2016 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.)
<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2016/entries/aristotle-metaphysics>

Kenny (1998) Ch.4

***Lear, Jonathan (1988) *Aristotle: the Desire to Understand* (CUP), Ch. 6. Esp. 6.3, 6.5 and 6.6.

Wiggings, David (1998) 'Substance' in A.C. Grayling (ed.) *Philosophy 1: A Guide through the Subject* (OUP), pp. 214-246, esp. sections 4.1 to 4.4 and 4.11-4.12.

Lecture 5: Aristotle on happiness and the soul

Tutorial 4 (week 5): Aristotle, <i>Nicomachean Ethics</i> , Book I and Book X sections 6-8.
--

**Ackrill, J. A. (1980), 'Aristotle on Eudaimonia', in Amelie O. Rorty, *Essays on Aristotle's Ethics* (University of California Press, 1980) [see also ch. 20 and 21]

Annas, Julia (1993) *The Morality of Happiness* (Oxford: OUP)

-- *(2006) 'Virtue ethics', in David Copp (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Ethical Theory* (New York: OUP), 515-36

Aristotle, *Nicomachean Ethics* (Books I, IV and X in particular), any edition

Bostock, D. (2000) *Aristotle's Ethics*, (Oxford: OUP), esp. Ch. I and IX.

Broadie, S. *Ethics with Aristotle* (OUP), Chapter 1.

Broadie, Sarah (2008) 'Aristotle and contemporary ethics', in her *Aristotle and Beyond: Essays in Metaphysics and Ethics* (Cambridge: CUP), 113–34.

Glassen, P. (1957) 'A Fallacy in Aristotle's Argument about the Good', *The Philosophical Quarterly*, 7: 319-22

**Heinaman, Richard (1988) 'Eudaimonia and Self-Sufficiency in Nicomachean Ethics', *Phronesis*, pp. 31-53.

***Hughes, Gerald J. (2003) *Routledge Philosophy Guidebook to Aristotle on Ethics*, (London: Routledge).

Jackson, Roy A. (2007) 'Aristotle on what it means to be happy', *Richmond Journal of Philosophy*, 16, www.richmond-philosophy.net/rjp/back_issues/rjp16_jackson.pdf

*Kraut, Richard (ed.) (2008) *The Blackwell Guide to Aristotle's Nicomachean Ethics* (Blackwell).

Kraut, Richard (2014) 'Aristotle's ethics', *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Summer 2014 Edition), E. N. Zalta (ed.), plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2014/entries/aristotleethics/

Islamic philosophy (general)

Adamson, Peter (2015) *Philosophy in the Islamic World: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: OUP)

-- (2013) *Interpreting Avicenna: Critical Essays* (Cambridge: CUP)

*-- and Richard C. Taylor (eds.) (2005) *The Cambridge Companion to Arabic Philosophy* (Cambridge: CUP)

Bertolacci, Amos, 2015. "Arabic and Islamic Metaphysics", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Ed. by Edward N. Zalta, URL = [<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2015/entries/arabic-islamic-metaphysics/>](https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2015/entries/arabic-islamic-metaphysics/).

D'Ancona, Cristina., 2016. "Greek Sources in Arabic and Islamic Philosophy", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* Ed. By Edward N. Zalta, URL = [<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2016/entries/arabic-islamic-greek/>](https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2016/entries/arabic-islamic-greek/).

Druart, Therese-Anne, 2016. "Al-Farabi", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Ed. By Edward N. Zalta, URL = [<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2016/entries/al-farabi/>](https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2016/entries/al-farabi/).

Griffel, Frank, 2016 "Al-Ghazali", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Ed. By Edward N. Zalta, URL = [<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2016/entries/al-ghazali/>](https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2016/entries/al-ghazali/).

_____, 2014. "Influence of Arabic and Islamic Philosophy on the Latin West", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Ed. By Edward N. Zalta, URL = [<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2014/entries/arabic-islamic-influence/>](https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2014/entries/arabic-islamic-influence/).

Hyman, A., Walsh, J.J. and Williams, T. eds., 2010. *Philosophy in the middle ages: The Christian, Islamic, and Jewish traditions*. Hackett Publishing.

*McGinnis, J. and Reisman, D.C., 2007. *Classical Arabic philosophy: an anthology of sources*. Hackett Publishing.

Richardson, Kara, 2015. "Causation in Arabic and Islamic Thought", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Ed. By Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2015/entries/arabic-islamic-causation/>>.

Stern, S.A.H. and Brown, V., 1972. *Islamic Philosophy and the Classical Tradition*. University of South Carolina Press.

Walzer, R., 1962. *Greek into Arabic; essays on Islamic philosophy*. Harvard University Press.

Lecture 6: Islamic philosophy I: Avicenna

Tutorial 5 (week 6): Avicenna, Selections from 'Psychology' from *The Cure*.

*-- Adamson, P. and Richard C. Taylor (eds.) (2005) *The Cambridge Companion to Arabic Philosophy* (Cambridge: CUP), Chapter 6.

***Adamson, P and Benevise, F. *The Thought Experimental Method: Avicenna's Flying Man Argument*, *Journal of the American Philosophical Association*, Vol 4 (2) (Summer 2018), pp. 147-164.

Black, D.L. 1999, "Mental Existence in Thomas Aquinas and Avicenna", *Mediaeval Studies*, vol. 61, no. 1, pp. 45-79. (available only in hard copy)

Black, D. 'Avicenna on self-awareness and knowing that one knows', in *The Unity of Science in the Arabic Tradition*, eds. S. Rahman, T. Street & H. Tahiri (Dordrecht: Springer, 2008), 59-78 (Link available on the Learning Resources Section of Blackboard)

Davidson, H.A., 1992. *Alfarabi, Avicenna, and Averroes on intellect: Their cosmologies, theories of the active intellect, and theories of human intellect*. Oxford University Press.

Griffel, Frank. 2014. *Avicenna and the Aristotelian Tradition: Introduction to Reading Avicenna's Philosophical Works. Including an Inventory of Avicenna's Authentic Works*. Brill.

_____, 2016. "Ibn Sina [Avicenna]", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Ed. By Edward N. Zalta, URL = <<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2016/entries/ibn-sina/>>.

Ivry, Alfred, 2012. "Arabic and Islamic Psychology and Philosophy of Mind", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Ed by Edward N. Zalta, URL = <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2012/entries/arabic-islamic-mind/>

Michael Marmura, 'Avicenna's "flying man" in context', *The Monist*, 69 (1986), 383-95 (Link available on the Learning Resources Section of Blackboard).

Wisnovsky, R., 2003. *Avicenna's metaphysics in context*. Cornell University Press.

Lecture 7: Islamic philosophy II: Al-Kindi

Tutorial 6 (week 7): Selections from *On the Means of Dispelling Sorrows*

*-- Adamson, P. and Richard C. Taylor (eds.) (2005) *The Cambridge Companion to Arabic Philosophy* (Cambridge: CUP), Chapter 3.

_____., 2015. "Al-Kindi", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Ed by Edward N. Zalta, URL = <<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2015/entries/al-kindi/>>.

*Leaman, O., 2002. *An introduction to classical Islamic philosophy*. Cambridge University Press, chapter 5.

_____., 2013. *History of Islamic philosophy*. Routledge.

Descartes (general)

*Brandhorst, Kurt (2010), *Descartes' Meditations on First Philosophy: An Edinburgh Philosophical Guide* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press)

*Cottingham, John (ed.) (1992) *The Cambridge Companion to Descartes* (Cambridge: CUP)

-- (ed.) (1998) *Descartes* (Oxford: OUP)

Doney, Willis (ed.) (1968) *Descartes: A Collection of Critical Essays* (London: Macmillan)

*Gaukroger, Stephen (ed.) (2006) *The Blackwell Guide to Descartes' Meditations* (Oxford: Blackwell)

***Hatfield, Gary (2014a) *The Routledge Philosophy Guidebook to Descartes and the Meditations* (London: Routledge)

-- (2014b) 'René Descartes', *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Summer 2014 Edition), E. N. Zalta (ed.), plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2014/entries/descartes/

Kenny (1998) Ch.11

Kenny, Anthony (1993) *Descartes: A Study of his Philosophy* (Bristol: Thoemmes Press)

Rorty, Amelie O. (ed.) (1986) *Essays on Descartes' Meditations* (Berkeley: University of California Press)

Wilson, Catherine (2003) *Descartes' Meditations: An Introduction*, Cambridge University Press

Lecture 8: On Descartes' Cogito

Tutorial 7 (week 8): *Descartes' Meditations, Objections and Replies*, edited and translated by Roger Ariew and Donald Cress, Hackett, Publishing Company Inc. 2006. (the Penguin edition translated by Desmond M. Clarke is also acceptable), *Meditations I & II*.

Abraham, W.E. (1974) 'Disentangling the 'Cogito'', *Mind*, vol. 83, issue 329, pp. 75-94.

***Cottingham, John (ed.) (1992) *The Cambridge Companion to Descartes*, Ch. 5.

Harrison, J. (1984) 'The Incorrigeability of the Cogito', *Mind*, vol. 93, issue 371, pp. 321-335.

***Hatfield, Gary (2014a) *The Routledge Philosophy Guidebook to Descartes and the Meditations*, Chs 3 and 4.

***Wilson, Margaret Dauler (1982) *Descartes* (London: Routledge), Ch. II, sec. 1-3.

*Williams, Bernard (1978) *Descartes: The Project of Pure Enquiry* (London: Penguin). NB There are various editions of this. The eBook version in the library is London: Routledge 2005, Ch. 3.

Lecture 9: On Descartes' dualism and Elisabeth of Bohemia's problem of interaction

Tutorial 8 (week 9): Descartes' *Meditations, Objections and Replies* (1641) edited and translated by Roger Ariew and Donald Cress, Hackett, Publishing Company Inc. 2006. (the Penguin edition translated by Desmond M. Clarke is also acceptable), *Meditations II & VI*

Elisabeth of Bohemia and Rene Descartes, 1643, *Correspondence*, in Lisa Shapiro (ed.) *The Correspondence between Princess Elisabeth of Bohemia and René Descartes*, University of Chicago Press, 2007.

Jacqueline Broad, 2002, 'Elisabeth of Bohemia' in her *Women Philosophers of the Seventeenth Century*, Cambridge University Press.

*Broadie, Sarah (2008) "Soul and body in Plato and Descartes", in her *Aristotle and Beyond: Essays in Metaphysics and Ethics* (Cambridge: CUP).

Clarke, Desmond M. (2003) *Descartes' Theory of Mind* (Oxford: OUP).

*Cottingham, John (ed.) (1992) *The Cambridge Companion to Descartes*, Ch. 8.

***Cottingham, J. 2006. 'The Mind-Body Relation' in S. Gaukroger (ed.) *The Blackwell Guide to Descartes' Meditations*, Blackwell.

***Garber, Daniel (2001), *Descartes Embodied* (CUP), Chapter 8.

***Hatfield, Gary (2014) *The Routledge Philosophy Guidebook to Descartes and the Meditations*, Chs 4 and 8.

*Heil, John (2013) *Philosophy of Mind. A Contemporary Introduction*, Ch. 2.

*** Janssen-Lauret, Frederique ' Elisabeth of Bohemia as a Naturalistic Dualist' in E. Thomas (ed.) *Early Modern Women on Science and Philosophy*, Cambridge University Press.

Marleen Rozemond, 2002, *Descartes' Dualism*, Harvard University Press.

*Williams, Bernard (1978) *Descartes: The Project of Pure Enquiry*, Ch. 10.

*Wilson, Margaret Dauler (1982) *Descartes*, Ch. 6.

Lecture 10: Spinoza's and Leibniz's solutions to the problem of interaction

Tutorial 9 (week 10): John Cottingham, *The Rationalists* (chapter 4)

Bobro, Marc, "Leibniz on Causation", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2016 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.)

<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2016/entries/leibniz-causation/>

**Cottingham, John (1988): *The Rationalists* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), Ch. 3 and 4.

*Garrett, D. (ed) *The Cambridge Companion to Spinoza* (CUP, 1996), Ch. 2.

**Heil, John (2013) *Philosophy of Mind. A Contemporary Introduction*, Ch. 3.

*Jolley, N. 'Metaphysics' in Donald Rutherford (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Early Modern Philosophy* (CUP, 2006). Ch. 4.

*Jolley, N.(ed) *The Cambridge Companion to Leibniz* (CUP, 1995), Ch. 5, sec. I-IV.

Jolley, Nicholas (2005) *Leibniz* (Routledge), Ch. 2 and 3.

**Leibniz, G. W, 'The Monadology' in *Discourse on Metaphysics and Other Essays*, translated by Daniel Garber and Roger Ariew (Hackett Publishing Company, 1991) (other editions also available) (esp. sections 1 to 22).

*Lennon, Thomas, M. (2005) 'The Rationalist Conception of Substance' in Alan Nelson (ed.) *A Companion to Rationalism* (Oxford: Blackwell).

Nadler, Steven, "Baruch Spinoza", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2016 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.) <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2016/entries/spinoza>

Saville, Anthony (2000) *Routledge Philosophy Guidebook to Leibniz and the Monadology* (London: Routledge), ch. 3.

Shein, Noa, "Spinoza's Theory of Attributes", *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Fall 2013 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.)

<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2013/entries/spinoza-attributes/>

**Spinoza, B. *Ethics*, translated by Samuel Shirley and edited and introduced by Seymour Feldman (Hackett Publishing Company, 1992) (other editions also available) (esp. Part I, propositions 1 to 15).

7. SAMPLE EXAM PAPER (for guidance only)*

HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY: SAMPLE EXAM

2016-17 SEMESTER 2

Answer one question from each section.

SECTION A

1. In 'On the Soul' Avicenna provides us with the Flying Man thought experiment. What does he ask us to imagine? What does he think it shows about the human soul? Do you agree with him?
2. Compare and contrast Avicenna and Aristotle's views of the rational soul. Which view is more plausible?
3. Al Kindi argues that if we want to avoid all misfortune then ultimately we do not want to exist at all. How does he argue for this? Is his argument a good one?

SECTION B

4. 'I think, therefore I am.' Is this claim true? How does Descartes argue for it?
5. What is the 'problem of interaction'? Can Descartes offer a solution to it? Discuss with reference to the debate between Descartes and Elisabeth of Bohemia.
6. What is the 'problem of interaction'? Can Spinoza's system sidestep the problem?

***Please note that in previous years the programme was slightly different so do not worry if you do not recognise some of the topics. Full guidance for exam preparation will be provided in the exam revision session.**

**FACULTY OF HUMANITIES
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES
PHILOSOPHY
COURSE UNIT OUTLINE 2017-18**

**INTRODUCTION TO METAPHYSICS AND EPISTEMOLOGY
PHIL10622
Semester 2 Credits: 20**

**This course guide should be read in conjunction with the
Philosophy Study Guide, available from the Philosophy Intranet.**

- Lecturer(s):** Dr. Stephen Ingram
Office: HBS 2.55
Telephone: TBC
Email: stephen.ingram@manchester.ac.uk
- Office Hours:** Mondays 13.00-14.00 and Thursdays 10.00-11.00
Please email to arrange an appointment outside of these hours.
- Tutors:** Beth Ansell, Joey Montgomery, Jeroen Smid, Jonas Raab, Fred Horton,
Jonathan Farrell, Jonathan Bebb
- Administrator:** Christopher Ashworth, UG Office, G.001 Arthur Lewis Building
Tel: 0161 275 7129, Email: christopher.ashworth@manchester.ac.uk
- Lectures:** Thursday 12.00-14.00
Stopford Theatre 3
- Tutorials:** The tutorial time slots are on page 4 of this document.
Allocate yourself to a tutorial group using the Student System
(this is compulsory and on a first come, first served basis)
- Assessment:** 1500 word essay (33%) and 2-hour unseen exam (67%)
- Easter Break:** Monday 8th April 2019 – Friday 26th April 2019
- Philosophy Intranet:** [Click here for the philosophy intranet](#)
Please go to the intranet for staff and TA office hours, the Philosophy
Study Guide, and advice on accessing online philosophy resources.

*****IMPORTANT INFORMATION – PLEASE READ*****

Pre-requisite(s): None

Communication: <i>Students must read their University e-mails regularly, as important information will be communicated in this way.</i>
--

Examination period Monday 13th May – Friday 7th June 2019

Re-sit Examination period Monday 19th August – Friday 30th August 2019

Please read this course outline through very carefully as it provides essential information needed by all students attending this course

1. ABOUT THE COURSE

Summary

My banana was green on Monday, yellow on Tuesday, and brown on Wednesday. Is it the same banana on each of these three days? If so, how is it possible for an object like a banana to persist through time, despite having different qualities? These are examples of *metaphysical* questions – they are questions about the nature of existence and the structure of reality.

Barry believes that he exists, that $2+3=5$, and that William Hartnell played the First Doctor. Are any of these beliefs justified? Are any of them knowledge? What is it for a belief to be justified, or known? Under what conditions must we suspend judgement on our beliefs? These are examples of *epistemological* questions – they are questions about knowledge and inquiry.

This course will examine a range of metaphysical and epistemological questions, and you will have the opportunity to engage creatively with ongoing debates about knowledge and reality.

Aims

This course aims to...

- ... introduce students to some key metaphysical and epistemological debates;
- ... expose the relation and the distinction between metaphysics and epistemology;
- ... highlight the intrinsic value of engaging in those debates;
- ... explain how even abstract areas of philosophy can have practical significance.

Learning Outcomes

By the end of this course, students will be able to...

- ... grasp the main contours of some key metaphysical and epistemological debates;
- ... form considered opinions about those debates;
- ... defend those opinions through reasoned argument;
- ... articulate those arguments in the context of essay and exam writing.

2. COURSE ORGANISATION

Lectures: Thursday 12.00-14.00
Stopford TH 3

Tutorials:

DAY & TIME	LOCATION	TEACHING ASSISTANT
Monday 10-11am	Crawford House_SEM RM A	Beth Ansell
Monday 11-12pm	Crawford House_SEM RM A	Beth Ansell
Monday 12-1pm	Crawford House_SEM RM A	Joey Montgomery
Monday 2-3pm	Crawford House_SEM RM A	Joey Montgomery
Monday 3-4pm	Crawford House_SEM RM A	Jeroen Smid
Monday 4-5pm	Crawford House_SEM RM A	Jeroen Smid
Weds 10-11am	Crawford House_SEM RM B	Jonas Raab
Weds 11-12pm	Crawford House_SEM RM B	Jonas Raab
Weds 12-1pm	Crawford House_SEM RM B	Jonas Raab
Thurs 2-3pm	Crawford House_SEM RM B	Fred Horton
Thurs 3-4pm	Crawford House_SEM RM B	Jonathan Farrell
Thurs 4-5pm	Crawford House_SEM RM B	Jonathan Farrell
Friday 10-11am	Sam Alex_A202	Jonathan Farrell
Friday 12-1pm	Crawford House_SEM RM B	Jonathan Farrell
Friday 3-4pm	Mansfield Cooper_2.04	Jon Bebb
Friday 1-2pm	Crawford House_SEM RM B	Jon Bebb
Friday 2-3pm	Crawford House_SEM RM B	Jon Bebb

Tutorials are weekly, **starting in week 2**. Attendance at tutorials is compulsory. It is students' responsibility to ensure that they have been allocated to a tutorial group. Students may not change group without permission.

3. TOPICS

Week 01 – Identity and Change

Week 02 – Causation and Necessity

Week 03 – Substances and Properties

Week 04 – Social Reality

Week 05 – What is Knowledge?

Week 06 – Justifying Belief

Week 07 – Scepticism

Week 08 – Disagreement

Week 09 – Intellectual Virtue

Week 10 – Epistemic Injustice

Week 11 – Exam Guidance Session

4. WORK AND ATTENDANCE

The work and attendance requirements for this course are that you:

Attend all tutorials. If you are absent from a tutorial through illness you should inform your tutor and fill in a Certification of Student Ill Health (available from your department or from the SoSS UG Office; see your degree programme handbook for details). If you are absent for another reason you must tell your tutor or the philosophy administrator ASAP – if possible, *before* the tutorial.

Prepare adequately for tutorials. You will be set preparatory work for tutorials; see the study budget below for a guide to roughly how long you should spend on this.

Complete written work on time. Failure to complete assessed work by the due date will constitute a violation of the work and attendance requirement.

Violations of work and attendance requirements will be reported to your Programme Director. If you have difficulties (e.g. personal, financial or family problems) that result in persistent failure to meet the work and attendance requirements, you should talk to your Programme Director or Academic Advisor.

Texts recommended for purchase

No text *must* be purchased. Some introductory texts are listed in the guided reading list. Required tutorial readings are available via Blackboard, and suggested texts are available through the library and (in many cases) the internet.

Course materials: Further materials will be available on the Blackboard site.
Log-in to Blackboard via [My Manchester](#)

Study skills and online resources

The Philosophy intranet site, has lots of useful information and advice on essay-writing and accessing e-journals and other online resources. It includes an 'essay bank' containing a couple of actual student essays with lots of comments on them. You can also download the Philosophy Study Guide, find out about staff and TA contact details, etc.

Study budget

The University's Academic Standards Code of Practice specifies that a 20 credit course is expected to require about 200 hours work by students. For this course, you are recommended to break this down roughly as follows:

Lectures	10 × 2 = 20 hours
Tutorials	10 hours
Tutorial preparation	10 × 5 hours = 50 hours
Essay preparation	40 hours
Exam preparation	80 hours
TOTAL:	200 hours

Prompt arrival at classes

Students should note that all lectures and tutorials start **on the hour** and should end at 50 minutes past the hour. Late arrival for tutorials may result in your being marked absent; if you arrive late it is your responsibility to ensure that your tutor has marked you as present.

5. ASSESSMENT

ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

For the assessment criteria for PHIL course units, see the [Philosophy Study Guide](#)) which also provides further guidance concerning the assessment criteria.

ASSESSED ESSAYS

One essay of **1500 words** which provides one third of your assessment for this course.

The word limit includes footnotes but **excludes** the bibliography. You must state the word count at the end of the essay – failure to do so will result in a deduction of 2 marks.

If an essay goes over the word limit by 10% or more, 5 marks will be deducted.

Presentation

Essays must be typed in at least 12 point in a readable font, and should be *double spaced*. They should include proper bibliography and references.

When submitting electronically the title of the file you upload should be your student ID number followed by the question number. All essays are marked anonymously; please do not put your name on the filename or anywhere in the essay.

Bibliography and Referencing

The lack of a proper bibliography and appropriate references (citations) will potentially greatly affect the mark for the work and may be considered plagiarism.

For full guidance on how to refer to works you are citing and paraphrasing in your essay, and how to write a bibliography, is provided in Chapter 5 of the Philosophy Study Guide. **You MUST follow this guidance.** Bibliography and referencing conventions can vary from discipline to discipline, and the conventions in Philosophy may differ from those employed in other subjects you are studying.

Plagiarism

Plagiarism is a form of academic malpractice that can result in serious penalties, including deduction of marks, the award of a mark of 0, and – in the most serious cases – exclusion from the University. There is also philosophy-specific guidance on plagiarism (and how to avoid plagiarising accidentally) in Chapter 5 of the Philosophy Study Guide.

Students should also consult the University's statement on plagiarism, which can be obtained from the School of Social Sciences student intranet.

Submitting your essay

PHIL20271 uses online submission and marking only.

You must submit your essay electronically to 'Turnitin' via Blackboard. Further instructions on this are available on the Blackboard site for the course, see: <https://online.manchester.ac.uk>

When submitting electronically the title of your essay (i.e. the filename) should be your student ID number, followed by the question number, i.e. xxxxxx Qy.

Failure to submit an electronic copy of your essay will result in a mark of zero.

Deadline

The submission date for the assessed essay is **02/04/19**. All essays should be submitted by **2pm** on the hand in day.

See the *Philosophy Study Guide* for information about the granting of extensions and penalties for unexcused late submission and for overlong essays.

Penalties for late submission of essays

Essays submitted after 2.00pm carry the following day's date.

Please see the Policy on the Submission of Work for Summative Assessment in relation to the institutional sliding scale for penalties relating to late submission of work (<http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/display.aspx?DocID=24561>).

Please note particularly point 4.7 *The mark awarded will reduce by 10 marks per day for 5 days (assuming a 0 -100 marking scale), after which a mark of zero will be awarded.*

Students who have a valid reason (*i.e.* mitigating circumstances with the necessary documentation) for not being able to submit their assessed essay on time should collect a mitigating circumstances form from the SoSS Undergraduate Office (Arthur Lewis Building, G.001), which should be completed and returned to G.001.

Accessing feedback for essays using online marking

Feedback on your assessed essay will be available on Blackboard no later than 15 working days after the essay deadline date (provided the essay is submitted on time).

To access the feedback please log into My Manchester and go to the **Blackboard** site for this module. Navigate to the **Submission of Coursework folder** and then click on and follow the instructions under: **'How to download your feedback from Turn it in'**

Please note that all essay marks are provisional until confirmed by the external examiner and the final examinations boards in June.

Students are welcome to discuss their essay with the course convener during their office hours.

If you've read to this point, feel free to send Stephen a picture of a cute dog or guinea pig.

Feedback

The School of Social Sciences (SoSS) is committed to providing timely and appropriate feedback to students on their academic progress and achievement, thereby enabling students to reflect on their progress and plan their academic and skills development effectively. Students are reminded that feedback is necessarily *responsive*: only when a student has done a certain amount of work and approaches us with it at the appropriate time is it possible for us to feed *back* on the *student's work*. The main forms of feedback on this course are written feedback responses to assessed essays and exam answers.

We also draw your attention to the variety of generic forms of feedback available to you on this as on all SoSS courses. These include...

- ... meeting the lecturer/tutor during their office hours;
- ... emailing questions to the lecturer/tutor;
- ... asking questions of the lecturer/tutor (before and after lecture/tutorial);
- ... presenting a question on the discussion board on Blackboard;
- ... obtaining feedback from your tutor during tutorials;
- ... obtaining feedback from your peers during tutorials.

Assessed Essay Titles

These will be posted on Blackboard early in the semester.

EXAMINATION

There will be a 2-hour unseen exam, and it will count for 67% of your final mark.

The exam will contain 6 questions, of which you must answer exactly 2.

The exam questions will be drawn from topics not covered in the essay questions.

Specifically, there will be questions relating to what we studied in the weeks on:

- ... What is Knowledge?
- ... Justifying Belief
- ... Scepticism
- ... Disagreement
- ... Intellectual Virtue
- ... Epistemic Injustice

A document containing advice on exam preparation and exam writing, as well as a set of sample exam questions, will be distributed some time in December.

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

PHILOSOPHY

COURSE UNIT OUTLINE 2018-19

<p>PHIL10631 Semester: 1 Credits: 20</p>

This course guide should be read in conjunction with the *Philosophy Study Guide 2018-19*, available from the Philosophy Intranet.

- Lecturer:** Dr. Stephen Ingram
Office: Room 2.46, Humanities Bridgeford Street Building
Telephone:
Email: stephen.ingram@manchester.ac.uk
Office Hours: Please email to arrange an appointment outside of these hours.
- Tutors:** Tutorials will be taken by Teaching Assistants – see below.
Their office hours will be posted here:
<https://www.socialsciences.manchester.ac.uk/student-intranet/undergraduate/your-programme/philosophy/contact-us/>
- Administrator:** Christopher Ashworth, UG Office, G.001 Arthur Lewis Building
Tel: 0161 275 7129, Email: christopher.ashworth@manchester.ac.uk
- Lectures:** Tuesday 2-3pm, Friday 1-2pm
- Tutorials:** Allocate yourself to a tutorial group using the Student System (this is compulsory and on a first come, first served basis)
- Assessment:** Exam 67%, Essay 33%
- Reading Week:** Monday 29th October 2018 – Friday 2nd November 2018
- Philosophy Intranet:** <http://www.socialsciences.manchester.ac.uk/student-intranet/undergraduate/course-information/philosophy/>
Please go to the intranet for staff and TA office hours, the Philosophy Study Guide, and advice on accessing online philosophy resources.

*****IMPORTANT INFORMATION – PLEASE READ*****

Pre-requisite(s): None

Communication: <i>Students must read their University e-mails regularly, as important information will be communicated in this way.</i>
--

Examination period: Monday 14 January – Friday 25 January 2019
Re-sit Examination period: Monday 19th August – Friday 30th August 2019

Please read this course outline through very carefully as it provides essential information needed by all students attending this course

2. ABOUT THE COURSE

Summary

This course explores philosophical issues about the nature of mind and mentality. Are mental states physical states of the brain, or are they states of an immaterial mind or soul, or something else altogether? We will examine various metaphysical theories of the nature of mind: dualism, behaviourism, the identity theory, functionalism, eliminative materialism, and the computational theory of mind. Many, perhaps all, mental states are about or represent things in the world. How do they do this? Can we explain mental representation physically or scientifically? Many mental states are also conscious. But what is consciousness? Is consciousness physical? Can it be explained scientifically? We will also try to understand exactly what it means to say that the mind is physical or that mental states depend on physical states and will try to determine whether the existence of mental causation favours a physicalist view of mind.

Aims

This course aims to:

- Introduce some central problems concerning the mind and its relation to the world.
- Help students develop a properly philosophical approach to the mind, including the ability to work out, analyse and criticise arguments in the literature.

Learning Outcomes

On successful completion of this course unit, students will be able to demonstrate:

- Introductory knowledge of the central philosophical problems in the philosophy of mind.
- A clear understanding of the problems raised by the texts studied.
- A clear sense of the arguments and positions defended in the texts studied.
- The ability to respond to these positions and arguments critically and with arguments of their own.

3. COURSE ORGANISATION

Lectures: Tuesday 2-3pm, Friday 1-2pm

Tutorials:

DAY & TIME	LOCATION	TEACHING ASSISTANT
Monday 10-11am	Crawford House_SEM RM C	L.Tomlinson
Monday 11-12pm	Crawford House_SEM RM C	L.Tomlinson
Monday 12-1pm	Crawford House_SEM RM C	L.Tomlinson
Monday 1-2pm	Crawford House_SEM RM C	J.Smid
Monday 2-3pm	Crawford House_SEM RM C	J.Smid
Tuesday 10-11am	Crawford House_SEM RM C	B.Ansell

Tuesday 11-12pm	Crawford House_SEM RM C	B.Ansell
Tuesday 1-2pm	Simon_1.34	B.Ansell
Thurs 9-10am	Crawford House_SEM RM B	A. De Jong
Thurs 11-12pm	Crawford House_SEM RM B	A. De Jong
Thurs 10-11am	Crawford House_SEM RM B	A. De Jong

Tutorials are weekly, starting in week 2. Attendance at tutorials is compulsory. It is students' responsibility to ensure that they have been allocated to a tutorial group. Students may not change group without permission.

Work and attendance

The work and attendance requirements for this course are that you:

- **Attend all tutorials**
If you are absent from a tutorial through illness you should inform your tutor and fill in a Certification of Student Ill Health (available from your department or from the SoSS UG Office; see your degree programme handbook for further details). If you are absent for another reason you should tell your tutor or the Philosophy Administrator, Chris Ashworth as soon as you can – if possible, *before* the tutorial.
- **Prepare adequately for tutorials**
You will be set preparatory work for tutorials; see the study budget below for a guide to roughly how long you should spend on this.
- **Complete written work on time**
Failure to complete assessed work by the due date constitutes a violation of the work and attendance requirement.

Violations of work and attendance requirements will be reported to your Programme Director. If you have difficulties (e.g. personal, financial or family problems) that result in persistent failure to meet the work and attendance requirements, you should talk to your Programme Director or Academic Advisor.

The textbook for the course is:

Ian Ravenscroft, *Philosophy of Mind: A Beginner's Guide*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.

The **required** weekly readings are from this book. There should be copies in the campus bookstore (Blackwell, who will price-match Amazon).

Here is a link to Blackwell's bookshop, displaying some of the additional recommended texts for the course:

http://bookshop.blackwell.co.uk/jsp/readinglists/displaylist.jsp?fm_course=30068

Course materials: Further materials will be made available on the courses Blackboard site. Log-in to Blackboard via My Manchester at: <https://online.manchester.ac.uk>

Study skills and online resources

The Philosophy intranet site, has lots of useful information and advice on, for example, essay-writing and accessing e-journals and other online resources. It includes an 'essay bank' containing

a couple of actual student essays with lots of comments on them. You can also download the **Philosophy Study Guide**, find out about staff and TA contact details, etc.

Study budget

The University's Academic Standards Code of Practice specifies that a 20 credit course is expected to require about 200 hours work by students. For this course, you are recommended to break this down roughly as follows:

Lectures	10 x 2 = 20 hours
Tutorials	10 hours
Tutorial preparation	10 x 5 hours = 50 hours
Essay preparation	40 hours
Exam preparation	80 hours

TOTAL: 200 hours

Prompt arrival at classes

Students should note that all lectures and tutorials start **on the hour** and should end at 50 minutes past the hour. Late arrival for tutorials may result in your being marked absent; if you arrive late it is your responsibility to ensure that your tutor has marked you as present.

4. ASSESSMENT

Assessment Criteria

For the assessment criteria for PHIL course units, see the *Philosophy Study Guide* (available online at: <http://www.socialsciences.manchester.ac.uk/student-intranet/undergraduate/course-information/philosophy/study-resources/>) which also provides further guidance concerning the assessment criteria.

EXAMINATION

One two-hour exam will be set at the end of semester one, in which you must answer two questions. This provides two thirds of your assessment for the course. You will not be able to reproduce material from your assessed essay in your exam.

Past Exam Papers can be found on the Blackboard site for this course.

ASSESSED ESSAYS

One essay of 1,500 words (titles listed below) which provides one third of your assessment for this course.

The word limit includes footnotes but **excludes** the bibliography.

Students must state the word count at the end of the essay – failure to do so will result in a deduction of 2 marks.

If an essay goes over the word limit by 10% or more, 5 marks will be deducted.

Presentation

Essays must be typed in at least 12 point in a readable font, and should be **double spaced**. They should include proper bibliography and references.

When submitting electronically the title of the file you upload should be your student ID number followed by the question number. All essays are marked anonymously; please do not put your name on the filename or anywhere in the essay.

Bibliography and Referencing

The lack of a proper bibliography and appropriate references (citations) will potentially greatly affect the mark for the work and may be considered plagiarism.

For full guidance on how to refer to works you are citing and paraphrasing in your essay, and how to write a bibliography, is provided in Chapter 5 of the Philosophy Study Guide. **You MUST follow this guidance.** Bibliography and referencing conventions can vary from discipline to discipline, and the conventions in Philosophy may differ from those employed in other subjects you are studying.

Plagiarism

Plagiarism is a form of academic malpractice that can result in serious penalties, including deduction of marks, the award of a mark of 0, and – in the most serious cases – exclusion from the University. There is also philosophy-specific guidance on plagiarism (and how to avoid plagiarising accidentally) in Chapter 5 of the Philosophy Study Guide.

Students should also consult the University's statement on plagiarism, which can be obtained from the School of Social Sciences student intranet.

Submitting your essay

PHIL10632 uses online submission and marking only.

You must submit your essay electronically to 'Turnitin' via Blackboard. Further instructions on this are available on the Blackboard site for the course, see: <https://online.manchester.ac.uk>

When submitting electronically the title of your essay (i.e. the filename) should be your student ID number, followed by the question number, i.e. xxxxxx Qy.

Failure to submit an electronic copy of your essay will result in a mark of zero.

Deadline

The submission date for the assessed essay is **2018**. All essays should be submitted **by 2pm** on the hand in day.

See the *Philosophy Study Guide* for information about the granting of extensions and penalties for unexcused late submission and for overlong essays.

Penalties for late submission of essays

Essays submitted after 2.00pm carry the following day's date.

Please see the Policy on the Submission of Work for Summative Assessment in relation to the institutional sliding scale for penalties relating to late submission of work (<http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/display.aspx?DocID=24561>).

Please note particularly point 4.7 *The mark awarded will reduce by 10 marks per day for 5 days (assuming a 0 -100 marking scale), after which a mark of zero will be awarded.*

Students who have a valid reason (*i.e.* mitigating circumstances with the necessary documentation) for not being able to submit their assessed essay on time should collect a mitigating circumstances form from the SoSS Undergraduate Office (Arthur Lewis Building, G.001), which should be completed and returned to G.001.

Accessing feedback for essays using online marking

Feedback on your assessed essay will be available on Blackboard no later than 15 working days after the essay deadline date (provided the essay is submitted on time).

To access the feedback please log into My Manchester and go to the **Blackboard** site for PHIL10632. Navigate to the **Submission of Coursework folder** and then click on and follow the instructions under: '**How to download your feedback from Turn it in**'

Please note that all essay marks are provisional until confirmed by the external examiner and the final examinations boards in June.

Students are welcome to discuss their essay with the course convenor during their office hours.

Feedback

The School of Social Sciences (SoSS) is committed to providing timely and appropriate feedback to students on their academic progress and achievement, thereby enabling students to reflect on their progress and plan their academic and skills development effectively. Students are reminded that feedback is necessarily *responsive*: only when a student has done a certain amount of work and approaches us with it at the appropriate fora is it possible for us to feed *back* on the *student's work*. The main forms of feedback on this course are written feedback responses to assessed essays and exam answers.

We also draw your attention to the variety of generic forms of feedback available to you on this as on all SoSS courses. These include: meeting the lecturer/tutor during their office hours; e-mailing questions to the lecturer/tutor; asking questions from the lecturer (before and after lecture); presenting a question on the discussion board on Blackboard; and obtaining feedback from your peers during tutorials.

Assessed Essay Titles

Is the existence of mental-physical causal interaction an insurmountable problem for dualism?

Should epiphenomenalism be taken seriously?

Does philosophical behaviourism get anything about the mind right?

5. COURSE OUTLINE

Week 1	Introduction
Week 2	Dualism
Week 3	Behaviourism
Week 4	The Identity Theory
Week 5	Functionalism
Week 6	Eliminativism & Fictionalism
Week 7	The Computational Theory of Mind
Week 8	Physicalism and Supervenience

Easter Vacation

Week 9	Content	[ESSAY DUE]
Week 10	Mental Causation	
Week 11	Phenomenal Consciousness	
Week 12	Summary and Exam Advice	

6. READING LIST

All reading lists are for guidance only! The texts listed should help you increase your understanding of the topics covered in the course, and help you prepare for the assessed essay and exam. But you are also encouraged to use your own initiative and find relevant articles and books by chasing up interesting footnotes, browsing real and virtual libraries, following your hunches, and so on.

LIBRARY'S PHILOSOPHY SUBJECT GUIDE

<http://subjects.library.manchester.ac.uk/philosophy>

Especially useful are the *databases*, *ebooks*, *ejournals*, and *reference works* on the Resources Tab. Many of the items on the reading list below can be found there.

GENERAL BACKGROUND READING

Reference Works

A Companion to the Philosophy of Mind, S. Guttenplan, ed., (Oxford, Blackwell, 1994)

Encyclopaedia of Philosophy (1967), 8 vols. Paul Edwards (ed.)

Internet Encyclopaedia of Philosophy <http://www.utm.edu/research/iep>

Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy <http://plato.stanford.edu>

Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics, Second Edition, Keith Brown, Editor-in-Chief. (Oxford: Elsevier, 2005).

A Field Guide to the Philosophy of Mind <http://host.uniroma3.it/progetti/kant/field/>

The Bloomsbury Companion to Philosophy of Mind, James Garvey, ed., (Bloomsbury, 2011)

Password-Protected Online Resources (see Library's Philosophy Subject Guide above)

The Blackwell Guide to the Philosophy of Mind, S. Stich and T. Warfield (eds.)

Oxford Handbooks Online

Oxford Scholarship Online

Routledge Encyclopaedia of Philosophy

Bibliographies

MindPapers <http://consc.net/mindpapers> is a massive online list of research works in philosophy of mind, organized by topic and sub-topic. It is part of an even more massive list of research articles in every area of contemporary philosophy, *PhilPapers* <http://philpapers.org/>, which is organized into areas and sub-areas, such as 'philosophy of language' and 'philosophy of mind' (both under the general heading of 'metaphysics and epistemology'). Some entries have abstracts and some do not.

Oxford Bibliographies <http://www.oxfordbibliographies.com> is very useful as the entries are accompanied by annotations briefly summarizing the works referred to. But you need a password (see Library's Philosophy Subject Guide above).

Journals

Philosophy Compass. This has survey articles on all subjects aimed at non-experts. Available online through the library's ejournals (see above).

Anthologies of classic and contemporary articles

Sean Crawford (ed.) *The Philosophy of Mind. Critical Concepts in Philosophy*, 4 vols. (Routledge 2011).

B. McLaughlin, A. Beckermann and S. Walter (eds.) *The Oxford Handbook of the Philosophy of Mind* (Oxford, 2009) [available online]

John Heil (ed.) *Philosophy of Mind. A Guide and Anthology*

David Rosenthal (ed.) *The Nature of Mind*

William G. Lycan (ed.) *Mind and Cognition*

T. O'Connor and D. Robb (eds.) *Philosophy of Mind: Contemporary Readings* [available online]

Ned Block (ed.) *Readings in the Philosophy of Psychology*, vols. 1-2

S. Stich and T. Warfield (eds.) *The Blackwell Guide to the Philosophy of Mind* [available online]

Richard Warner and Tadeusz Szubka (eds.) *The Mind-Body Problem : A Guide to the Current*

Debate

David Chalmers (ed.) *Philosophy of Mind. Classical and Contemporary Readings* (Oxford, 2002)
Tim Crane and Sarah Patterson (eds.) *History of the Mind-Body Problem* (Routledge, 2000)

Other textbooks

Barbara Montero, *On the Philosophy of Mind* [introductory; available online]
William Lyons, *Matters of the Mind*. [introductory]
Colin McGinn, *The Character of Mind*, 2nd ed. [intermediate]
Jaegwon Kim, *Philosophy of Mind*, 3rd ed. [advanced; available online]
David Braddon-Mitchell and Frank Jackson, *Philosophy of Mind and Cognition*, 2nd ed [advanced]
Gregory McCulloch, *The Mind and Its World* [intermediate]
Keith Campbell, *Body and Mind* [introductory]
John Heil, *Philosophy of Mind*, 2nd ed. [intermediate]
Samuel D. Guttenplan, *Mind's Landscape* [intermediate]
E. J. Lowe, *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Mind* [intermediate]
John Searle, *Mind. A Brief Introduction* [intermediate]
Peter Smith and O.R. Jones, *The Philosophy of Mind* [intermediate]
Paul Churchland, *Matter and Consciousness* [introductory]
George Graham, *Philosophy of Mind. An Introduction* [introductory]

TOPIC-BY-TOPIC WEEKLY READING LIST

WEEK 1 INTRODUCTION

No tutorials

Recommended introductory reading

Colin McGinn, *The Character of Mind*, 2nd ed., ch. 1 'Mental Phenomena'
Jerry Fodor, 'The Mind-Body Problem', *Scientific American* (1981); repr. in Richard Warner and Tadeusz Szubka (eds.) *The Mind-Body Problem: A Guide to the Current Debate*
Barbara Montero, *On the Philosophy of Mind*, chs. 1-3
Susan James, 'The Emergence of the Cartesian Mind', in Tim Crane and Sarah Patterson (eds.) *History of the Mind-Body Problem* (Routledge, 2000)
Jenny Teichman, *The Mind and the Soul: An Introduction to the Philosophy of Mind*
Kathleen Wilkes, *Real People*, ch. 7, 'Models of Mind'
John Haugeland, *Artificial Intelligence. The Very Idea*, ch. 1 'The Saga of the Modern Mind'

WEEK 2 DUALISM

Lecture & Tutorial Reading: Ian Ravenscroft, *Philosophy of Mind: A Beginner's Guide*. ch. 1

Further Reading (see also Ravenscroft's suggestions at the end of the chapter)

Jaegwon Kim, 'Lonely Souls: Causality and Substance Dualism', in T. O'Connor and D. Robb (eds.) *Philosophy of Mind: Contemporary Readings* [available online]
E. J. Lowe, 'The Problem of Psycho-Physical Causation', *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* 70 (1992): 263-76; reprinted in T. O'Connor and D. Robb (eds.) *Philosophy of Mind: Contemporary Readings* [available online]
W. D. Hart, 'Dualism', in S. Guttenplan (ed.) *A Companion to the Philosophy of Mind*
Howard Robinson, 'Dualism', in Stich and Warfield (eds.) *The Blackwell Guide to the Philosophy of Mind* [available online]
D. M. Armstrong, *The Mind-Body Problem. An Opinionated Introduction*, ch. 2, 'Descartes' Dualism'
Marleen Rozemond (2006). 'The Nature of the Mind'. In Stephen Gaukroger (ed.), *Blackwell Guide to Descartes' Meditations* [online access]
Margaret D. Wilson, 'Descartes: The Epistemological Argument for Mind-Body Distinctness', *Noûs* 10.1 (1976): 3 -15

Paul Churchland, *Matter and Consciousness* (MIT, 1988), pp. 7-23
 Daniel Dennett, *Consciousness Explained* (Penguin, 1991), Ch. 2
 D. M. Armstrong, *The Mind-Body Problem. An Opinionated Introduction*, ch. 4, 'T. H. Huxley's Epiphenomenalism'
 Keith Campbell, *Mind and Body*, ch. 6, 'The New Epiphenomenalism'
 Jaegwon Kim, 'Epiphenomenal and Supervenient Causation', *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 9 (1984): 257-70.
 Sven Walter, 'Epiphenomenalism', in *Internet Encyclopaedia of Philosophy*:
<http://www.iep.utm.edu/epipheno/>
 William Robinson, 'Epiphenomenalism', in *Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy*:
<https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/epiphenomenalism/>

WEEK 3 BEHAVIOURISM

Lecture & Tutorial Reading: Ravenscroft, ch. 2

Further Reading (see also Ravenscroft's suggestions at the end of the chapter)

Gilbert Ryle, 'Descartes's Myth' and selections from *The Concept of Mind* (1949), in Sean Crawford (ed.) *The Philosophy of Mind. Critical Concepts in Philosophy*
 D. Dennett, Introduction to the 2000 Penguin edition of Ryle's *The Concept of Mind*.
 D. M. Armstrong, *The Mind-Body Problem. An Opinionated Introduction*, ch. 5, 'Ryle's Rejection of Two Realms'
 William Lyons, *Matters of Mind*, ch. 2
 Geach, Peter. *Mental Acts*, Sections 1-5; repr. in Block (ed.) *Readings in the Philosophy of Psychology*, vol. 2 and S. Crawford (ed.) *The Philosophy of Mind. Critical Concepts in Philosophy*
 Putnam, Hilary, 'Brains and Behaviour' in R. J. Butler (ed.) *Analytical Philosophy*, vol. 2; repr in Block (ed.), *Readings in the Philosophy of Psychology*, vol. 1; and in Putnam's *Philosophical Papers, vol. 2 Mind, Language and Reality* and in S. Crawford (ed.) *The Philosophy of Mind. Critical Concepts in Philosophy*
 J. Fodor, *Psychological Explanation*, ch2.
 Alex Byrne, 'Behaviourism', in S. Guttenplan (ed.) *A Companion to the Philosophy of Mind* (Blackwell, 1994); online at: <http://web.mit.edu/abyrne/www/behaviourism.html>
 Keith Campbell, *Mind and Body*, ch. 4
 Galen Strawson, *Mental Reality*, chs, 1, 2, & 9 [argues strongly against behaviourism]

WEEK 4 THE IDENTITY THEORY

Lecture & Tutorial Reading: Ravenscroft, ch. 3

Further Reading (see also Ravenscroft's suggestions at the end of the chapter)

J.J.C. Smart, 'Sensations and Brain Processes', *The Philosophical Review* LXVIII, 2 (April 1959): 141-156; widely reprinted, e.g., in David Rosenthal (ed.), *The Nature of Mind* and S. Crawford (ed.) *The Philosophy of Mind. Critical Concepts in Philosophy*
 Jerome Shaffer, 'Mental Events and the Brain', *The Journal of Philosophy* 60 (1963): 160-66
 C. V. Borst (ed.) *The Mind/Brain Identity Theory. A Collection of Papers* (1970)
 David M. Rosenthal (ed.) *Materialism and the Mind-Body Problem* (1971)
 Simone Gozzano and Christopher S. Hill (eds.) *New Perspectives on Type Identity* (Cambridge 2012) [online access]
 D. M. Armstrong, *The Mind-Body Problem. An Opinionated Introduction*, ch. 6, 'The Identity Theory'
 Hilary Putnam, 'The Nature of Mental States'; widely reprinted; e.g., in D. Rosenthal (ed.) *The Nature of Mind*; originally published as 'Psychological Predicates' in W. H. Capitan and D D. Merrill (eds.) *Art, Mind and Religion*; repr. under the original title in John Heil (ed.) *Philosophy of Mind. A Guide and Anthology*.
 Keith Campbell, *Body and Mind*, ch5
 Jaegwon Kim, *Philosophy of Mind*, 3rd ed., ch 4 [online access]

WEEK 5 FUNCTIONALISM

Lecture & Tutorial Reading: Ravenscroft, ch. 4

Further Reading (see also Ravenscroft's suggestions at the end of the chapter)

Keith Campbell, *Mind and Body*, ch. 6

David Armstrong, 'The Nature of Mind', in Armstrong's *The Nature of Mind* and in Ned Block (ed.) *Readings in the Philosophy of Psychology*, vol.1; originally in C. V. Borst (ed.) *The Mind/Brain Identity Theory*.

Thomas Nagel, 'Armstrong on the Mind', *Philosophical Review* 79 (1970): 394-403

Hilary Putnam, 'The Nature of Mental States'; widely reprinted; e.g., in D. Rosenthal (ed.) *The Nature of Mind*; originally published as 'Psychological Predicates' in W. H. Capitan and D D. Merrill (eds.) *Art, Mind and Religion*; repr. under the original title in John Heil (ed.) *Philosophy of Mind. A Guide and Anthology*.

Ned Block, 'Troubles with Functionalism', in N. Block (ed.) *Readings in the Philosophy of Psychology*, vol. 1; widely repr in philosophy of mind anthologies such as S. Crawford (ed.) *The Philosophy of Mind. Critical Concepts in Philosophy*, vol. 2

David Lewis, 'Mad Pain and Martian Pain', in Ned Block (ed.) *Readings in the Philosophy of Psychology*, vol. 1; repr. in David Rosenthal (ed.) *The Nature of Mind*

Robert Van Gulick, 'Functionalism', in *The Oxford Handbook of the Philosophy of Mind*, McLaughlin, Beckermann and Walter, eds.

Jaegwon Kim, *Philosophy of Mind*, 3rd ed., chs 5 & 6 [available online via library]

Janet Levin, 'Functionalism', *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.

<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/functionalism/>

WEEK 6 ELIMINATIVISM & FICTIONALISM

Lecture & Tutorial Reading: Ravenscroft, ch. 5

Further Reading (see also Ravenscroft's suggestions at the end of the chapter)

John D. Greenwood (ed.) *The Future of Folk Psychology* (Cambridge 1991)

Paul Churchland, 'Eliminative Materialism and the Propositional Attitudes', *Journal of Philosophy* 78 (1981): 67-90

Paul Churchland, 'Folk Psychology and the Explanation of Human Behaviour', in Greenwood T. Horgan and J. Woodward, 'Folk Psychology is Here to Stay', *Philosophical Review* 94 (1985): 197-226; repr. in Greenwood

Daniel Dennett, 'True Believers: The Intentional Strategy and Why it Works', in Dennett's *The Intentional Stance* (1987)

Daniel Dennett, 'Two Contrasts: Folk Science vs. Folk Craft and Belief vs. Opinion', in Greenwood Lynn Rudder Baker, *Saving Belief*, ch 8 [available online]

Stephen Stich, 'Dennett on Intentional Systems', *Philosophical Topics* 12 (1981); repr. in J. I. Biro and Robert W. Shahan (eds.) *Mind, Brain, and Function. Essays in the Philosophy of Mind* (1982)

Daniel Dennett, 'Making Sense of Ourselves', *Philosophical Topics* 12 (1981); repr. in J. I. Biro and Robert W. Shahan (eds.) *Mind, Brain, and Function. Essays in the Philosophy of Mind* (1982) [reply to Stich's critique]

John Heil, *Philosophy of Mind*, 2nd ed., chs 14 & 15 [online access]

WEEK 7 THE COMPUTATIONAL THEORY OF MIND

Lecture & Tutorial Reading: Ravenscroft, ch. 6

Further Reading (see also Ravenscroft's suggestions at the end of the chapter)

J. Fodor, 'The Big Idea', *Times Literary Supplement*, 3 July, 1992. [popular presentation]

J. Fodor, *The Language of Thought* (1975)

Tim Crane, *The Mechanical Mind*, 2nd ed., chs. 3 & 4 [7 & 8 in the 3rd ed. (2016)]

John Searle, 'Minds, Brains and Programs', *The Behavioral and Brain Sciences* III, 3 (September

1980): 417-24 and repr. D. Rosenthal (ed.) *The Nature of Mind*

The following debate between John Searle and Jerry Fodor is appended to the end of the version of Searle's 1980 original article in the reprint in Rosenthal:

J. Fodor, 'Searle on What Only Minds Can Do'

J. Searle, 'Author's Response'

J. Fodor, 'Yin and Yang in the Chinese Room'

J. Searle, 'Yin and Yang Strike Out'

See also the extensive open peer commentary accompanying the original journal article in *Behavioral and Brain Sciences* and Searle's replies.

Patricia and Paul Churchland (1990). 'Could a Machine Think?' *Scientific American*, 262, 1 (Jan)

Louise Antony, 'Thinking', in *The Oxford Handbook of the Philosophy of Mind*, McLaughlin, Beckermann and Walter, eds.

George Graham, *Philosophy of Mind. An Introduction*, ch 5

Margaret Boden. *Computer Models of the Mind*, pp. 238–251; reprinted as 'Escaping from the Chinese Room', in M. A. Boden, *The Philosophy of Artificial Intelligence*.

Steven Pinker, *The Way the Mind Works* (1997)

On how computers work and the history of computing

Jack B. Copeland, 'The Modern History of Computing', *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*: <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/computing-history/>

John Haugeland, *Artificial Intelligence. The Very Idea*, esp. ch 2

Martin Davis, *The Universal Computer. The Road from Leibniz to Turing* (alternative title: *The Engines of Logic. Mathematicians and the Origin of the Computer*)

Joseph Weizenbaum, *Computer Power and Human Reason*, chs. 2 & 3

W. Daniel Hillis, *The Pattern on the Stone. The Simple Ideas that Make Computers Work* [available online via the library]

WEEK 8 PHYSICALISM AND SUPERVENIENCE

Lecture & Tutorial Reading: Ravenscroft, ch. 8

Further Reading (see also Ravenscroft's suggestions at the end of the chapter)

David Papineau, 'The Case for Materialism', in his *Thinking about Consciousness* [available online]; abridged and easier version reprinted in J. Feinberg and R. Shafer-Landau (eds.) *Reason and Responsibility*, 12th and 16th editions.

Patricia Churchland, *Touching a Nerve*

J. J. C. Smart, 'The Content of Physicalism', *Philosophical Quarterly* 28: 239-41

Barbara Montero, *On the Philosophy of Mind*, ch. 16

Barbara Montero, 'The Body Problem', *Nous* 33: 183-200

Alyssa Ney (2008). 'Defining Physicalism'. *Philosophy Compass*, 3 (5): 1033-1048

Jaegwon Kim, *Philosophy of Mind*, 3rd ed., pp. 8-14

Jaegwon Kim, *Supervenience and Mind*

Robert Francescotti, 'Supervenience and Mind', *Internet Encyclopaedia of Philosophy*: <http://www.iep.utm.edu/supermin/>

WEEK 9 CONTENT

Lecture & Tutorial Reading: Ravenscroft, ch. 9

Further Reading (see also Ravenscroft's suggestions at the end of the chapter)

D. Dennett and J. Haugeland, 'Intentionality', in R. Gregory (ed.) *The Oxford Companion to the Mind* and online here: <https://ase.tufts.edu/cogstud/dennett/papers/intentio.htm>

Tim Crane, *The Mechanical Mind*, 2nd edition, chs. 1 & 5 [chs. 1, 2, 3, 9 & 10 in 3rd ed.]

Robert Cummins, *Meaning and Mental Representation*

Hilary Putnam, 'Meaning and Reference', *The Journal of Philosophy* 70 (1973): 699-711

Colin McGinn, 'Content', ch 5 of McGinn's *The Character of Mind*, 2nd ed.

Gregory McCulloch, *The Mind and Its World*, chs 7 & 8

Jaegwon Kim, *Philosophy of Mind*, 3rd ed., ch. 8 [online access]

WEEK 10 MENTAL CAUSATION

Lecture & Tutorial Reading: Ravenscroft, ch. 10

Further Reading (see also Ravenscroft's suggestions at the end of the chapter)

Jaegwon Kim, *Philosophy of Mind*, 3rd ed., ch. 7 [online access]

Jaegwon Kim, *Mind in a Physical World. An Essay on the Mind-Body Problem and Mental Causation*

Julie Yoo, 'Mental Causation', *Internet Encyclopaedia of Philosophy*:

<http://www.iep.utm.edu/mental-c/>

John Heil, *Philosophy of Mind*, 2nd ed., ch 13 [online access]

WEEK 11 PHENOMENAL CONSCIOUSNESS

Lecture & Tutorial Reading: Ravenscroft, chs. 11 & 12

Further Reading (see also Ravenscroft's suggestions at the end of the chapter)

Frank Jackson, 'Epiphenomenal Qualia', *Philosophical Quarterly* 32 (1982): 127-136.

Frank Jackson, 'What Mary Didn't Know', *Journal of Philosophy* 83 (1986): 291-295; repr. in S. Crawford (ed.) *The Philosophy of Mind. Critical Concepts in Philosophy*

Daniel C. Dennett, *Consciousness Explained* [see pp. 398-406 for Dennett's account of Mary]

Owen Flanagan, *Consciousness Reconsidered* [see pp. 97-102 for Flanagan's account of Mary; this section is in S. Crawford (ed.) *The Philosophy of Mind. Critical Concepts in Philosophy*].

David Lewis, 'What Experience Teaches', in W. Lycan (ed.) *Mind and Cognition*. Oxford: Blackwell, 1990; repr. in Lewis's *Papers in Metaphysics and Epistemology*. [knowledge-how reply]

Martine Nida-Rümelin, 'Qualia: The Knowledge Argument', *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, online at: <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/qualia-knowledge/>

Thomas Nagel, 'What is it Like to be a Bat?', *Philosophical Review* 83 (1974): 435-50; repr. in S. Crawford (ed.) *The Philosophy of Mind. Critical Concepts in Philosophy*

Joesphine Levine, 'Materialism and Qualia: The Explanatory Gap', *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* 64 (1983): 354-61

Joseph Levine, *Purple Haze* (2001)

Alex Byrne, 'What Mind-Body Problem? Understanding Consciousness May be Easier than we Thought' *Boston Review* May/June: 27-30 (2006) online at:

<http://www.bostonreview.net/BR31.3/byrne.php>

Brie Gertler, 'A defense of the knowledge argument', *Philosophical Studies* 93.3 (1999): 317-336.

Janet Levin, 'Could love be like a Heatwave? Physicalism and the subjective character of experience', *Philosophical Studies* 49 (1986): 245-61.

John Heil, *Philosophy of Mind*, 2nd ed., ch 9 [online access]

Barbara Montero, *On the Philosophy of Mind*, chs. 7 & 8

WEEK 12

No tutorials

Summary and Exam Advice

1. Is the mind a kind of computer?
2. Are inverted qualia a problem for functionalism?
3. Should a physicalist deny that Mary the colour scientist can know all the physical facts about colour while confined to her black and white room?
4. What is the greatest challenge facing the mind-brain type-identity theory? Can it be overcome?
5. Is eliminativism self-refuting?
6. What are the prospects for a causal theory of mental content?