

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES  
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

**PHILOSOPHY**

**COURSE UNIT OUTLINE 2017-18**

|  |
|--|
| <p><b>PHIL20021 Philosophy of Religion</b><br/><b>Semester: 1    Credits: 20</b></p> |
|--|

**This course guide should be read in conjunction with the *Philosophy Study Guide 2016-17*, available from the Philosophy Intranet.**

- Lecturer(s):** Dr Michael Scott  
**Office:** Humanities Bridgeford Street 2.56  
**Telephone:** 0161 275 3875  
**Email:** [michael.scott@manchester.ac.uk](mailto:michael.scott@manchester.ac.uk)  
**Office Hours:** Tuesdays 10-11, Wednesdays 11-12.  
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:  
<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:** Tues 11-1pm.
- Tutorials:** Allocate yourself to a tutorial group using the Student System (this is compulsory and on a first come, first served basis)
- Assessment:** 2 hour exam                      67%  
2,000 word essay                      33%
- Reading Week:** Monday 30<sup>th</sup> October 2017 – Friday 3<sup>rd</sup> November 2017
- 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\*\*\***

|                          |      |
|--------------------------|------|
| <b>Pre-requisite(s):</b> | None |
|--------------------------|------|

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

**Examination period:** Monday 15 January – Friday 26 January 2018

**Re-sit Examination period:** Monday 20th August – Friday 31st August 2018

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 provides a detailed introduction and analysis of the central problems and issues in contemporary philosophy of religion.

The questions that we will consider include: Can we prove God's existence by reason alone? Is the evidence of 'fine tuning' conditions in the universe a good reason to believe that God created it? Is it either consistent or plausible to believe that there is a God given the amount of evil in the world? Can we ever be justified in believing that a miracle has occurred? Is religious belief rational if there is no evidence in its favour? What is the relationship between scientific and religious belief?

In the course of examining these topics we will look at major contemporary writings on religious belief and language, including work by Ludwig Wittgenstein, Alvin Plantinga and Richard Swinburne.

### Aims

- Engagement with some of the most central and enduring problems in philosophy of religion;
- Enhance your power of critical analysis, reasoning and independent thought, and your ability to bring those powers to bear on important philosophical issues;
- Familiarise you with some of the most interesting and provocative texts in contemporary work on philosophy of religion.

### Learning Outcomes

- Knowledge and understanding of a range of central 20th century texts on philosophy of religion;
- Some in-depth critical knowledge of the most important modern and contemporary theories in the areas covered by the course;
- The ability to critically reflect on those theories, and to articulate and defend your own views.

## 3. COURSE ORGANISATION

**Lectures:**

**Tutorials:**

| DAY & TIME | LOCATION | TEACHING ASSISTANT |
|------------|----------|--------------------|
|------------|----------|--------------------|

|  |  |  |
|--|--|--|
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

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, Caroline Harmer 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. However, since

demand for library books is likely to be high, students may find it useful to buy these overviews/collections:

**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 2,000 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**

PHIL20021 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 **7.11.2017**. 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 PHIL20021. 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. Is there a defensible analysis of divine omnipotence?
2. Assess the temporal or *kalam* cosmological arguments for the existence of God.
3. Explain Anselm's ontological argument. Where does it go wrong?

## 5. COURSE OUTLINE

References (on the right) are to sections and author in *Reading Philosophy of Religion* by Graham Oppy & Michael Scott (Wiley-Blackwell: 2010). For the Thurs lecture, you should work through the reading in bold print and do the exercises. The reading in light print is also relevant.

|        |                       |                       |
|--------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Week 1 | Divine Properties     | 4: <b>Savage</b>      |
| Week 2 | Cosmological Argument | 2: <b>Aquinas</b>     |
| Week 3 | Ontological Argument  | 2: <b>Anselm</b>      |
| Week 4 | Argument for Design   | 2: Paley, <b>Hume</b> |
| Week 5 | Problem of Evil       | 2: <b>Mackie</b>      |

### READING WEEK (30 Oct – 3 Nov)

|         |                        |                            |
|---------|------------------------|----------------------------|
| Week 7  | Faith and reason       | 3: <b>Clifford</b> , James |
| Week 8  | Pascal's Wager         | 2: <b>Pascal</b>           |
| Week 9  | Basic Belief           | 3: <b>Plantinga</b>        |
| Week 10 | Religious Disagreement | 5: Hick, <b>Plantinga</b>  |
| Week 11 | Divine Foreknowledge   | 4: <b>Pike</b>             |

Weekly tutorials (starting with divine properties) will address issues raised in the preceding lecture.

## 6. READING LIST

The texts above have been selected from *Reading Philosophy of Religion* by Graham Oppy & Michael Scott (Wiley-Blackwell: 2010). This is a useful book for introductions for each topic but need to be supplemented by reading that will be provided online.

Detailed supplementary reading lists will be provided on Blackboard for each topic.

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.

## 8. SAMPLE EXAM PAPER (for guidance only)

Answer two questions.

1. Explain Anselm's ontological argument for the existence of God. Is it sound?
2. Does the existence of evil provide conclusive evidence against the existence of God?
3. Is human free will compatible with divine omniscience?

4. Have reformed epistemologists shown that theism can be a properly basic belief? If they have, can belief in the Great Pumpkin also be properly basic? If they have not, are any perceptual beliefs properly basic?
5. Does the orderliness of the universe provide good evidence for the existence of God?
6. Is religious exclusivism a defensible position?

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES  
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

**PHILOSOPHY**

**COURSE UNIT OUTLINE 2018-19**

**PHIL20042 Formal Logic**  
**Semester: 2    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:** Wed 12-1; Fri 12-1.  
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:  
<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:** Thursday 10-12, Kilburn TH 1.3
- Tutorials:** Allocate yourself to a tutorial group using the Student System (this is compulsory and on a first come, first served basis)
- Assessment:** One 3 hour exam.
- Easter Break:** Monday 8<sup>th</sup> April 2019 – Friday 26<sup>th</sup> 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):** PHIL10041 Critical Thinking

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

**Examination period:** 15 May – 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 will cover the syntax and semantics of a propositional logic PL. Next, a natural deduction system will be introduced for proving the validity of sequents and theorems in PL. Subsequently the course will extend the grammar and proof procedure developed for PL to encompass a language of first-order predicate logic with identity, QL.

### Aims

Introduce students to the elements of formal propositional and first-order predicate logic. The course will introduce two systems of logic and provide a proof-procedure for each.

### Learning Outcomes

Students should be able to construct formulas of propositional and predicate logic, translate English sentences into these formulas, and prove sequents within a natural deduction system for these two formal languages.

Knowledge and Understanding:

Knowledge of elementary propositional and first-order logic and their associated proof procedures.

Intellectual skills:

As above.

Practical skills:

The ability to formalise patterns of argument in an abstract and rigorous form.

Transferable skills and personal qualities:

Improved argumentation skills.

## 3. COURSE ORGANISATION

**Lectures:** See Above

**Tutorials:**

| DAY & TIME  | LOCATION                | TEACHING ASSISTANT |
|-------------|-------------------------|--------------------|
| Mon 9-10am  | Crawford House_SEM RM B | S.Walgenbach       |
| Mon 10-11am | Crawford House_SEM RM B | S.Walgenbach       |
| Tue 12-1pm  | Crawford House_SEM RM D | J.Berskyte         |
| Tue 1-2pm   | Crawford House_SEM RM D | J.Berskyte         |
| Tue 2-3pm   | Crawford House_SEM RM D | J.Berskyte         |
| Fri 12-1pm  | Sam Alex_A214           | S.Walgenbach       |
| Fri 12-1pm  | Sam Alex_A202           | J.Berskyte         |

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:

R.L. Simpson, *Essentials of Symbolic Logic*, Broadview Press, 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.

**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 |
| Exam preparation     | 120 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 three-hour exam will be set at the end of semester one, in which you must answer ALL questions.

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

### **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  | PL: Truth-functions and Formation Rules |
| Week 2  | Proofs in PL (1)                        |
| Week 3  | Proofs in PL (2)                        |
| Week 4  | Proofs in PL (3)                        |
| Week 5  | QL (1)                                  |
| Week 6  | QL (2)                                  |
| Week 7  | Proofs in QL (1)                        |
| Week 8  | Proofs in QL (2)                        |
| Week 9  | Definite Descriptions in QL             |
| Week 10 | Revision (Mock Exam)                    |
| Week 11 | Revision session                        |
| Week 12 | Revision Drop - ins                     |

## 8. SAMPLE EXAM PAPER (for guidance only)

**Please note that the structure, content, mark-scheme, etc. are subject to change from year to year – THIS IS FOR ROUGH GUIDANCE ONLY**

Logic Exam [SAMPLE]

Answer ALL questions. There are 100 possible marks.

1. Which of the following are wffs of PL? If they are not wffs of PL, explain why.

10 marks

- a.  $(\forall x)Fx$
- b.  $(\sim A \wedge \sim A)$
- c.  $\sim (\phi \vee \psi)$
- d.  $\sim(\sim(A \supset \sim A))$

2. Prove the following sequents of PL.

30 marks

- a.  $A \wedge B, A \supset (B \wedge C), \sim(C \wedge G) \vdash \sim G$
- b.  $\vdash \sim(A \wedge B) \equiv (\sim A \vee \sim B)$
- c.  $P \supset (Q \vee R), \sim R \vdash P \supset Q$
- d.  $\sim A \vee B, \vdash (C \supset A) \supset (C \supset B)$
- e.  $(P \supset (\sim Q \vee R)) \supset ((P \supset Q) \supset (P \supset R))$

3. Translate the following into formulas of QL, restricting the domain of quantification where appropriate.

20 marks

- a. Russell's theory of descriptions is difficult.
- b. Everyone knows someone taller than them.
- c. Frege wrote more than two books.
- d. No-one finds the logic exam easy.

4. Prove the following sequents of QL.

40 marks

- a.  $\sim(\exists x) x = x \vdash (\forall z) \sim(Fz \vee \sim Fz)$
- b.  $(\exists x) \sim(Fx \wedge Gx) \vdash \sim(\forall x) \sim(\sim Fx \vee Gx)$
- c.  $(\exists x) (Fx \vee Gx) \vdash (\exists x)Fx \vee (\exists x)Gx$
- d.  $\vdash (\forall x)(\forall y)(Fx \wedge \sim(Rxy \supset Rxx)) \equiv (\forall x)(Fx \wedge \sim(\exists y)(Rxy \supset Rxx))$

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES  
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

**PHILOSOPHY**

**COURSE UNIT OUTLINE 2018-19**

|   |
|---|
| <b>PHIL20211</b><br><b>Semester: 1    Credits: 20</b> |
|---|

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

**Lecturer(s):** Dr Paula Satne  
**Office:** Humanities Bridgeford Street, 2.45  
**Telephone:** 0161 275 4777  
**Email:** paula.satne@manchester.ac.uk  
**Office Hours:** Wednesday 10-11 am  
Thursday 14-15hs

Please email to arrange an appointment outside of these hours.

**Tutors:** Tutorials will be taken by Oliver Spinney  
Teaching Assistant 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 11-1pm

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

**Assessment:** 2 hour exam 67%  
2'000 word essay 33%

**Reading Week:** Monday 29<sup>th</sup> 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\*\*\***

|                               |
|-------------------------------|
| <b>Pre-requisite(s):</b> None |
|-------------------------------|

|  |
|--|
| <b>Communication:</b> <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. **Please email a photo of a penguin to Paula Satne after reading the course outline.**

## 2. ABOUT THE COURSE

### Summary

This module is devoted to studying some of the most important work of the empiricist philosophers, Locke, Berkeley and Hume. The issues raised by these philosophers have been profoundly important in shaping the landscape of contemporary analytical philosophy, and many of the problems they raised and addressed are as relevant to philosophy today as they were then. Questions about, for example, the possibility of innate ideas and principles, the nature of perception, the existence of a reality independently of our minds, and the nature of causation, have all been handed down to us, in part, as a legacy of empiricism.

The module will approach the subject both by examining the philosophical works of Locke, Berkeley and Hume, and by looking at the ways in which their insights and concerns have been inherited by current analytical philosophers.

### Aims

This module aims to:

- help students gain in-depth knowledge and understanding of some of the central questions raised, and the positions taken, by the classical British empiricists;
- enable students to critically evaluate some of the positions taken and the arguments offered by Locke, Berkeley and Hume;
- enable students to appreciate the extent to which some of the central themes of modern analytical philosophy have their origins in the work of Locke, Berkeley and Hume;
- contribute towards giving students the requisite knowledge and analytical skills to tackle courses in modern analytical philosophy.

### Learning Outcomes

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

- a thorough knowledge and understanding of the texts studied;
- a considered critical perspective on some of the central questions and disputes raised by the texts;
- an ability to write concisely, relevantly and analytically about the questions raised by the classical British empiricists, both in an essay and under exam conditions;
- the ability to contribute effectively to discussion in tutorials.

### 3. COURSE ORGANISATION

**Lectures:** Thursday 11-13hs

**Tutorials:**

| DAY & TIME  | LOCATION        | TEACHING ASSISTANT |
|-------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| Fri 11-12pm | Sam Alex_A202   | O.Spinney          |
| Fri 12-1pm  | Sam Alex_A201   | O.Spinney          |
| Fri 1-2pm   | Uni Place_6.208 | O.Spinney          |

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. However, since demand for library books is likely to be high, students may find it useful to buy these overviews/collections:

#### Texts recommended for purchase:

Fortunately, all the primary historical texts are free to download from the internet. So there is no need to buy any of these texts if you don't want to. However, please avoid Jonathan Bennett's modernization of the primary texts at [Early Modern Texts](#) and stick to the original. The reason for this is that it is extremely questionable whether he succeeds in preserving the original meaning. The website [Archive](#) is very good. I have found PDFs of all the primary readings here (sometimes you need to scroll down a bit to find a link which gives you a PDF of the book, but they are there).

### The primary readings are taken from:

J. **Locke**, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*.

G. **Berkeley**, *Principles of Human Knowledge* and *Three Dialogues between Hylas and Philonous*.

D. **Hume**, *A Treatise on Human Nature* and *An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding*.

Alternatively, if you look at the free kindle e-books on Amazon, you can download free e-books of all the primary reading onto your PC, iPad etc. For instance, see Locke's [Essay](#) here.

If you do want to buy a secondary text, consider buying one of the starred secondary texts on the general reading list at the end of this course guide. (They are starred because I think they are particularly accessible and/or useful.)

**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 (67%)

**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 (33%)

**One essay of 2'000 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

PHIL20212 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 **13 November 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 PHIL20211. 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

Answer one of the following questions:

1. Is Locke's attack on nativism successful?
2. Explain and evaluate Locke's theory of perception
3. Does Locke successfully argue for the primary/secondary quality distinction?
4. Can Locke's empiricism be reconciled with his apparent endorsement of an idea of substance which is "... nothing, but the supposed, but unknown support of the qualities, we find existing, which we imagine cannot subsist... without something to support them...." (Locke, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*. II.xxiii.2)?

## 5. COURSE OUTLINE

|                         |   |
|-------------------------|---|
| Week 1 (w/c 24/09/18):  | Organisation and General Introduction: The Cartesian Legacy |
| Week 2 (w/c 01/10/18):  | Locke I: The Attack on Nativism                             |
| Week 3 (w/c 08/10/18):  | Locke II: Ideas and Perception                              |
| Week 4 (w/c 15/10/18):  | Locke III: Primary and Secondary Qualities                  |
| Week 5 (w/c 22/10/18):  | Locke IV: Substance and Essence                             |
| Week 6 (w/c 29/10/18):  | <b>READING WEEK (no lecture or tutorials)</b>               |
| Week 7 (w/c 05/11/18):  | Berkeley I: The Critique of Abstraction                     |
| Week 8 (w/c 12/11/18):  | Berkeley II: Berkeley's Idealism                            |
| Week 9 (w/c 19/11/18):  | Hume I: Ideas and Impressions                               |
| Week 10 (w/c 26/11/18): | Hume II: Causation  |
| Week 11 (w/c 03/12/18): | Hume III: Morality  |
| Week 12 (w/c 10/12/18): | Hume IV: Personal identity and Exam Revision                |

Weekly tutorials (**starting in Week 2**) will address the issues raised in each lecture. Week-by-week tutorial questions and reading list will be posted up on Blackboard at least one week before the tutorial. The tutorial will take place one day after the lecture. Therefore, I suggest that you read the tutorial reading and answer the questions before the lecture. You can then revise/ adjust your answers after the lecture has taken place. Tutorial readings are based on primary texts. I will make some suggestions for a key secondary reading (strongly recommended but not compulsory).

### **Resources 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 will all be available on the 'Course content' section of the Blackboard site. You **must bring both the set text and your answers to the tutorial** (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*).

**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.

**Podcasts:** There are some relevant audio podcasts in the 'Podcasts' section of Blackboard. Listening to these can be a good way of getting an easily-digestible overview.

### **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:** Some 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](https://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 and secondary sources and textbooks:** Here primary sources refer to the original material (i.e. by Locke, Hume, etc.) and secondary reading refers to more recent commentaries, journal articles and books. Both primary sources and secondary reading include generally pieces of original philosophical research which argue for a particular view

In contrast, 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 or random lecture notes that appear on your first google search).

There are of course lots and lots of books and journal articles on these authors 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. (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. 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. Asterisked items are, in my opinion, particularly good.

### A. BOOKS

#### a. Primary texts

J. Locke, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*.  
G. Berkeley, *Principles of Human Knowledge; Three Dialogues between Hylas and Philonous*.  
D. Hume, *A Treatise on Human Nature; An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding*.

#### b. Secondary texts: Locke, Berkeley and Hume

\*Jonathan Bennett, *Locke, Berkeley, Hume: Central Themes* (OUP, 1971).  
\*Jonathan Bennett, *Learning from Six Philosophers* (OUP, 2001).  
R.S. Woolhouse, *The Empiricists*, (OUP, 1998).

#### c. Secondary texts: Locke

M. R. Ayers, *Locke* (Routledge, 1991).  
V. Chappell, ed., *The Cambridge Companion to Locke* (CUP, 1994).  
V. Chappell, ed., *Locke* (OUP, 1998).  
Nicholas Jolley, *Locke* (OUP, 1999).  
\*E. J. Lowe, *Locke on Human Understanding* (Routledge, 1995).  
\*J. L. Mackie, *Problems from Locke* (Clarendon, 1976).  
L. Newman, *The Cambridge Companion to Locke's Essay on Human Understanding* (CUP, 2007).  
\*I. C. Tipton, ed., *Locke on Human Understanding* (OUP, 1977).

#### d. Secondary texts: Berkeley

\*J. Dancy, *Berkeley: An Introduction* (Oxford: OUP, 1987).  
\*R. Fogelin, *Berkeley and the Principles of Human Knowledge* (Routledge, 2001).  
J. Foster and H. Robinson (eds.), *Essays on Berkeley* (Clarendon, 1985).  
A.C. Grayling, *Berkeley: The Central Arguments* (Routledge, 1986).  
C.B. Martin and D.M. Armstrong (eds.), *Locke and Berkeley* (Macmillan, 1968).  
G. Pitcher, *Berkeley* (Routledge, 1977).  
T. Stoneham, *Berkeley's World*, (OUP, 2002).  
C. Turbayne, *Berkeley: Critical and Interpretive Essays* (Minnesota UP, 1982).  
J. Urmson, *Berkeley* (OUP, 1982).  
G. Warnock, *Berkeley* (Pelican, 1953).  
Winkler, K. [The Cambridge Companion to Berkeley](#), (CUP, 2006).

#### e. Secondary texts: Hume

A.J. Ayer, *Hume* (OUP, 1980).  
V.C. Chappell (ed.), *Hume* (Macmillan, 1966).  
D. Fate Norton, D. (ed.) [The Cambridge Companion to Hume](#), (CUP, first edition 1993, second edition 2009).  
A. Flew, *Hume's Philosophy of Belief* (Routledge, 1961).  
R. Fogelin, *Hume's Scepticism* (Routledge, 1985).

J. Harrison, *Hume's Moral Epistemology* (OUP, 1976).  
 \*J.L. Mackie, *Hume's Moral Theory* (Routledge, 1980).  
 P. Millican, (ed.) *Reading Hume on Human Understanding*, (OUP, 2002).  
 \*H. Noonan, *Hume on Knowledge* (Routledge, 1999).  
 D. Pears, *Hume's System* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1990).  
 G. Strawson, *The Secret Connexion: Realism and David Hume* (Blackwell, 1989).  
 \*B. Stroud, *Hume* (Routledge, 1977).

## B. WEEK-BY-WEEK READING LIST

### ORGANISATION AND INTRODUCTION TO THE COURSE: THE CARTESIAN LEGACY

No tutorial and no required reading.

### LOCKE I: THE ATTACK ON NATIVISM

#### Tutorial texts

**Primary source** (mandatory):

Locke, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, I.i.8, I.ii (i.e. Book I, Ch. I, Section 8, Book I, Chs. II)

**Key secondary reading** (strongly recommended):

Jolley, *Locke*, Ch. 3. (link available on Blackboard)

**Further reading** (optional):

Locke, *Essay*, Epistle to the Reader, I. iii-iv.

#### Further secondary reading:

Leibniz, *New Essays on Human Understanding*, trans. P. Remnant and J. Bennett (CUP, 1981), 1.1-3.

M. Atherton, M. 'Locke and the Issue over Innateness', in V. Chappell, ed., *Locke* (OUP, 1998). Bennett, Ch. 1.

J. Harris, 'Leibniz and Locke on Innate Ideas', *Ratio* 16 (1974): 226-42; reprinted in Tipton. Lowe, Ch. 2.

Mackie, *Problems from Locke*, Ch. 7.

G. Wall, 'Locke's Attack on Innate Knowledge', *Philosophy* 49 (1974): 414-19.

V. Chappell, 'Locke's Theory of Ideas', in Chappell, ed., *Locke* (OUP, 1998).

### LOCKE II: IDEAS AND PERCEPTION

#### Tutorial texts:

**Primary sources** (mandatory):

Locke, *Essay*, II.i-ix.

**Key secondary reading** (strongly recommended):

J.L. Mackie, *Problems from Locke*, Ch. 2. (link available on Blackboard)

#### Further secondary reading:

Ayers, Vol. I, Part I.

Bennett, Ch. 4.

Jolley, Ch. 3.

Lowe, Ch. 3.

Mackie, *Problems from Locke*, Ch 4.

G. A. J. Rogers (2004): 'Locke and the objects of perception', *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly*, vol. 85, pp.245 –254.

P. Smith and O. R. Jones, *The Philosophy of Mind* (CUP, 1986), Ch. 7.

### LOCKE III: PRIMARY AND SECONDARY QUALITIES

#### **Tutorial texts**

##### **Primary source** (mandatory):

Locke, *Essay*, II.viii.

##### **Key secondary reading** (strongly recommended):

J.L. Mackie, *Problems from Locke*, Chs. 1. (link available on Blackboard)

#### **Further secondary reading:**

Berkeley, *Principles of Human Knowledge*, §§9-13

P. Alexander, 'Boyle and Locke on Primary and Secondary Qualities', *Ratio* 16 (1974).

P. Boghossian and D. Velleman, 'Colour as a Secondary Quality', *Mind* 98 (1989).

J. Campbell, 'A Simple View of Colour', in J. Haldane and C. Wright, eds., *Reality, Representation and Projection*. (OUP, 1993).

Lowe, Ch. 3.

Jolley, Ch. 4.

Bennett, Ch. 4.

P.M.S. Hacker, *Appearance and Reality* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1987).

B. Maund, Color. *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/color>

C. McGinn, *The Subjective View* (Clarendon, 1982), Ch. 2.

J. McDowell, 'Values and Secondary Qualities', in T. Honderich (ed.), *Morality and Objectivity* (London: Routledge, 1985); reprinted in his *Mind, Value and Reality* (Harvard UP, 1998).

A.D. Smith, 'Of Primary and Secondary Qualities', *Philosophical Review* 99 (1990).

### LOCKE IV: SUBSTANCE AND ESSENCE

#### **Tutorial texts**

##### **Primary source** (mandatory):

Locke, *Essay*, II.xxiii, III.vi.

##### **Key secondary reading** (strongly recommend):

E.J. Lowe, Locke on Human Understanding, Ch. 3. (link available on Blackboard)

##### **Further reading** (optional):

J.L. Mackie, *Problems from Locke*, Ch. 3. (link available on Blackboard)

#### **Further Secondary reading:**

Berkeley, *Principles of Human Knowledge*, §§16-17.

Leibniz, *New Essays on Human Understanding*, pp. 217-26.

Ayers, Vol. II, Part I.

Jolley, Ch. 4.

Mackie, Ch. 3.

Bennett, Ch. 3.

## BERKELEY I: THE CRITIQUE OF ABSTRACTION

### **Tutorial texts:**

#### **Primary sources** (mandatory):

Berkeley, *Principles*, Introduction.

#### **Key secondary reading** (strongly recommended):

Pitcher, *Berkeley*, Ch. 5. (link available on Blackboard)

#### **Further reading** (optional):

Mackie, *Problem from Locke*, Ch. 4. (link available on Blackboard)

### **Further secondary reading:**

Bennett, Ch. 2.

Dancy, Ch. 3.

Fogelin, Ch. 8.

I. Hacking, *Why Does Language Matter to Philosophy?* (Cambridge: CUP, 1975), Ch. 4.

Urmson, pp. 23-31.

Warnock, Ch. 4.

## BERKELEY II: BERKELEY'S IDEALISM

### **Tutorial text:**

#### **Primary source** (mandatory):

Berkeley, *Principles* §§1-48.

#### **Key Secondary Reading** (strongly recommended):

Jonathan Dancy, *Berkeley: An Introduction*, Ch. 5. (link available on Blackboard)

#### **Further reading** (optional):

Berkeley, *Principles* §§ 49-134.

### **Further secondary reading:**

Berkeley, *Three Dialogues between Hylas and Philonous*, 1<sup>st</sup> Dialogue, 2<sup>nd</sup> Dialogue 216-226, Third Dialogue 234-238, 247-248. (N.B. The page numbers refer to those of the Luce and Jessop edition, which appear in the margin of the Ayers (Dent) edition.)

Bennett, Chs. 5,6.

Fogelin, Chs. 3-6.

Pitcher, Chs. 6-10.

Urmson, Chs. 2-3.

Warnock, Ch. 5.

J. Foster, 'Berkeley on the Physical World', in Foster and Robinson.

H. Robinson, 'The General Form of the Argument for Berkelian Idealism', in Foster and Robinson.

## HUME I: IDEAS AND IMPRESSIONS

### Tutorial texts:

#### **Primary sources** (mandatory):

Hume, *Treatise*, I.i.1-7, I.iv.2, I.iv.4.  
(N.B. 'I.i.7' means 'Book I, Part i, Section 7'.)

#### **Key Secondary Reading** (strongly recommended):

Barry Stroud, *Hume*, Ch. 2 (link on Blackboard)

#### **Further reading** (optional):

Hume, *Treatise*, I.ii.6, I.iii.1, I.iii.7.

#### **Secondary reading:**

Hume, *Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding*, II, III.

Bennett, *Locke, Berkeley, Hume*, Ch. 9.

Bennett, *Learning from Six Philosophers* Vol. 2, Ch. 32.

Flew, Ch. 2.

Noonan, Ch. 2.

Pears, Chs. 1, 2.

Everson, S. "The Difference between Thinking and Feeling", *Mind*, vol. 97, No. 387 (Jul 1988): 401- 413.

## HUME II: CAUSATION

### Tutorial texts

#### **Primary sources** (mandatory):

Hume, *Treatise*, I.iii.2-6, I.iii.8, I.iii.14-15.  
(e.g. Book I, Part iii, Section 14: pp. 155-72 in the Nidditch edition).

#### **Key Supplementary Reading** (strongly recommended):

Harold Noonan, *Hume on Knowledge*, Ch. 3 (link available on Blackboard)

#### **Further readings** (optional) (both texts available on BB):

Beebe, H. 'Hume's Two Definitions: The Procedural Interpretation', *Hume Studies Volume 37*, Number 2 (2011), 243-274.

Beebe, H. 'Hume on Causation: The Projectivist Interpretation' in In Huw Price & Richard Corry (eds.), *Causation, Physics, and the Constitution of Reality: Russell's Republic Revisited*. Oxford University Press (2007)

#### **Further secondary readings:**

Hume, *Enquiry*, IV, V, VII.

Ayer, Ch. 4.

Bennett, Chs. 11, 12.

Bennett, *Learning from Six Philosophers* Vol. 2, Chs. 35 and 36.

Flew, Ch. 6.

Pears, Chs. 5-7.

Strawson, Chs. 14, 15.

Stroud, Chs. 3-4.

## HUME III: HUME ON MORALITY

### Tutorial texts:

#### **Primary source** (mandatory):

Hume, *Treatise*, II.iii.3, III.i.1-2.

(e.g. Book II, Part iii, Section 3: pp. 413 and ff. in the Nidditch edition, and Book III, part I, section 1 and 2, pp. 455 and ff. in the Nidditch edition. Page numbers below are from the Nidditch edition).

**Key Supplementary Readings** (strongly recommended):

J.L. Mackie, *Hume's Moral Theory*, Ch. 4\_(Link on Blackboard)

**Further readings** (optional):

Rachel Cohon, 'Hume's Moral Philosophy', *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.(Link on Blackboard)

Hume, *An Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals*, I, Appendix I.

**Further secondary readings:**

Ayer, Ch. 5.

Harrison, Chs. 1, 2, 4-6.

Mackie, *Hume's Moral Theory*, Chs. 4, 5.

D. McNaughton, *Moral Vision* (Blackwell, 1988), Chs. 2, 4.

M. Smith, 'The Humean Theory of Motivation', *Mind* 96 (1987).

M. Smith, *The Moral Problem* (Blackwell, 1994), Chs. 2, 4.

Stroud, Ch. 8.

**HUME III: HUME ON PERSONAL IDENTITY**

**Primary Reading** (mandatory):

*Treatise* I. iv. 6

Book 1, Part IV, Section vi, of Hume's *Treatise*: 'Of Personal Identity'

**Key Supplementary Readings** (strongly recommended)

McIntyre, J. "Hume and the Problem of Personal Identity" in D. F. Norton and J. Taylor (eds.) (2009) *The Cambridge Companion to Hume* (available online through the University's website)

**Further reading** (optional):

*Treatise*, Appendix

**Secondary reading:**

C. G. Swain (1991): 'Being Sure of Oneself: Hume on Personal Identity', *Hume Studies*, vol. XVII, no. 2, pp.107-124.

J. Bennett (2001): *Learning from Six Philosophers*, Vol. 2, Chapter 40.

Noonan, ch. 5

Chapter 6 ('Hume and the Problem of Personal Identity' in D. F. Norton and J. Taylor (eds.) (2008): *The Cambridge Companion to Hume*, CUP.

D. Pears, *Hume's System*, ch. 9.

B. Stroud (1977): *Hume*, ch. 6.

## **8. SAMPLE EXAM PAPER (for guidance only)**

### **Candidates must answer TWO questions.**

- 1) What is the traditional substratum interpretation of Locke's account of substance? What difficulties does this interpretation face?
- 2) What is Berkeley's objection to Locke's account of abstract ideas? Is his critique compelling?
- 3) Why does Berkeley think that the idea of material substance is incoherent? Is he correct?
- 4) What is Hume's copy principle? Is there an adequate reply to the 'missing shade of blue' objection to it?
- 5) Is causation constant conjunction?
- 6) Does Locke's account of perception of the material world compel us to be sceptical about its existence, as Hume thought, or idealists, as Berkeley thought?

**PHILOSOPHY**

**COURSE UNIT OUTLINE 2018-19**

**PHIL20242 20<sup>th</sup> Century Analytical Philosophy**  
**Semester: 2 Credits: 20**

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

- Lecturer(s):** Prof Thomas Uebel  
**Office:** Humanities Bridgeford Street 2.51  
**Telephone:** 0161 275 4621  
**Email:** [thomas.e.uebel@manchester.ac.uk](mailto:thomas.e.uebel@manchester.ac.uk)  
**Office Hours:** Tuesday 1pm-3pm  
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:  
<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](mailto:christopher.ashworth@manchester.ac.uk)
- Lectures:** Wednesday 11-1, Simon 2.60
- Tutorials:** Please allocate yourself to a tutorial group using the Student System -- this is compulsory and on a first come, first served basis.
- 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):** 20 units of Level 1 Philosophy courses

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

**Assessment:**                2 hour Exam                67%  
                                     2,000 word Essay        33%

**Examination period:**                Monday 13 May – Friday 24 May 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**

Analytical (or analytic) philosophy is one of the most vibrant traditions in contemporary Western philosophy. We will study a selection of leading figures in this tradition, including those who gave birth to it in the early period of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, those who contributed to its development and to the different forms it took in the ensuing decades, as well as some currently influential practitioners of it. We will study some of the important problems, methods, techniques and principles that shaped it during the 20th century and that continue to shape it in the 21st. Some emphasis will be laid upon analytical philosophy's use of symbolic logic as a tool of clarification, analysis and problem-solving. Topics and figures covered will be selective and may vary from year to year.

Very broadly speaking the topics covered will be epistemology and metaphysics, philosophy of language and philosophical logic. The course provides a good background for the following advanced courses: PHIL30011/2 Russell, PHIL 30251/2 Wittgenstein, PHIL30311/2 Philosophy of Language, PHIL30331/2 Issues in Epistemology.

This year we will cover the following: Gottlob Frege, G. E. Moore, Bertrand Russell, Ludwig Wittgenstein, Moritz Schlick, Rudolf Carnap, Otto Neurath, A.J. Ayer, W. V. O. Quine, Paul Grice and Peter Strawson

### **Aims**

The course aims to:

- provide an understanding of the nature and development of the analytical tradition in philosophy
- provide historical background for some of the contemporary debates in the analytical tradition
- help students to understand some of the central writings in the tradition
- introduce students to some of the techniques and methods associated with the analytical tradition

### **Learning Outcomes**

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

- familiarity with different strands of philosophy in the analytical tradition
- appreciation of (some of) the major issues discussed in this tradition
- informed criticism of (some of) the most important positions taken on these issues
- familiarity with the nature of (some of) the techniques and methods associated with the tradition as well as their scope and limits

### 3. COURSE ORGANISATION

**Lectures:** Wednesday 11-1, Simon 2.60

**Tutorials:**

| DAY & TIME  | LOCATION                | TEACHING ASSISTANT |
|-------------|-------------------------|--------------------|
| Thu 11-12pm | Crawford House_SEM RM A | J.Bentley          |
| Thu 12-1pm  | Crawford House_SEM RM A | J.Bentley          |
| Fri 2-3pm   | Mansfield Cooper_4.08   | O.Spinney          |
| Fri 3-4pm   | Mansfield Cooper_2.05   | O.Spinney          |

Tutorials are weekly, **starting in week 2**, and continue to week 12. 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.

#### Required Textbooks:

There is no textbook you are required to buy. For historical overviews and background information, see any of the sources and books listed at the beginning of the reading list.

Tutorial readings will be articles or book chapters made available via Blackboard, and recommended readings are available through the library as e-journal articles or chapters in e-books.

**Course materials:** Required weekly tutorial readings, along with tutorial discussion questions, and further materials, will be made available on the course's 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 2,000 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

PHIL20242 20<sup>th</sup> Century Analytical Philosophy 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**. 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.

Penalties for late submission are as follows: 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 (Lewis, 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 course unit. 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. Is it really necessary, as Frege maintains, to recognize a “third realm” of “Thoughts” (*Gedanken*)?
2. Does Frege’s theory of sense (*Sinn*) and reference (*Bedeutung*) solve the problem of how identity statements can be informative?
3. How does Russell’s theory of descriptions deal with the problem of bearerless names? Does it succeed in doing so?.
4. How is Russell’s theory of descriptions meant to help to explain our knowledge of the external world? Does it succeed in doing so?

## 5. COURSE OUTLINE

### **Week 1 (lecture 30/1, no tutorials)**

Introduction: Overview of Course and Philosophical Background of Analytical Tradition

### **Week 2 (lecture 6/2, tutorials 7-8/2)**

Gottlob Frege: Thought and Language in Logical Perspective

### **Week 3 (lecture 13/2, tutorials 14-15/2)**

Bertrand Russell: Knowledge by Acquaintance and Description

### **Week 4 (lecture 20/2, tutorials 21-22/2)**

Ludwig Wittgenstein I: The *Tractatus*-Project

### **Week 5 (lecture 27/2, tutorials 28/2-1/3)**

Logical Empiricism I: The Attack on Metaphysics

### **Week 6 (lecture 6/3, tutorials 5-6/3)**

Logical Empiricism II: The Attack on Empirical Foundations

### **Week 7 (lecture 13/3, tutorials 14-15/3)**

Ludwig Wittgenstein II: After Logical Atomism: Meaning as Use

### **Week 8 (lecture 20/3, tutorials 21-22/3)**

Logical Empiricism III: Critique of Verificationism and Reductionism

### **Week 9 (lecture 27/3, tutorials 28-29/3)**

W.V.O. Quine I: Naturalism and the Analytic/Synthetic Distinction

### **Week 10 (lecture 3/4, tutorials 4-5/4)**

W.V.O. Quine II: Naturalism and the Possibility of Metaphysics

Easter Vacation

### **Week 11 (lecture 1/5, tutorials 2-3/5)**

Moore and Wittgenstein: Answers to External World Scepticism

### **Week 12 (revision session 8/5)**

Informal Q&A session on examination material.

## 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. Some of the items on the reading list below can be found there.

### SOURCES

#### Free Online Reference Works

The premier free online resource is the *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*: clear and concise entries on philosophical issues, individual philosophers and philosophical movements, with very useful bibliographies, regularly updated. See <http://plato.stanford.edu/contents.html> Highly recommended!

Another free online resource is the *Internet Encyclopaedia of Philosophy* <http://www.iep.utm.edu/>.

#### Bibliographies

*PhilPapers* <http://philpapers.org/> is a massive online list of research works in philosophy 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).

#### Survey Journals

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

#### General Histories of the Period ("\*\*" = online availability at library)

Jones, W.T., Fogelin, R., *The Twentieth Century to Quine and Derrida*, 3<sup>rd</sup> ed., Wadsworth, 1997

Kenny, A., *New History of Western Philosophy Vol.4. Philosophy in Modern World*, OUP, 2007.\*\*

Passmore, A *Hundred Years of Philosophy*, Penguin, 1956.

Skorupski, J., *English-Language Philosophy 1750-1945*, OUP, 1993

Schwartz, S.P., *A Brief History of Analytic Philosophy. Russell to Rawls*. Wiley-Blackwell, 2012.

#### Anthologies of Classic Articles

Parenthetical abbreviations will be used to refer back to these works in weekly reading lists.

Ammerman, R. (ed.), *Classics of Analytical Philosophy*, Hackett, Indianapolis, 1980 (=“CAP”)  
Ayer, A.J. (ed.), *Logical Positivism*, The Free Press, New York, 1959 (=“LP”)  
Feigl, H., Sellars, W. (eds.), *Readings in Philosophical Analysis*, New York, 1949 (=“RAP”)  
Hanfling, O. (ed.), *Readings in Logical Positivism*, Blackwell, Oxford, 1981 (=“RLP”)  
Martinich, A.P., Sosa, D. (eds.), *Analytic Philosophy. Anthology*, Blackwell, Oxford, 2001 (=“AP”)  
Rorty, R. (ed.), *The Linguistic Turn*, 1967, repr. Univ. of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1992 (=“LT”)  
Weitz, M. (ed.), *The Analytic Tradition in Philosophy*, The Free Press, New York, 1966 (=AT)

**Secondary Sources: Anthologies or Critical Articles** (“\*\*\*” = online availability at library)

Reference back to these works in the weekly reading lists is by title abbreviation.

Baldwin, T. (ed.), *The Cambridge History of Philosophy 1870-1945*, CUP, 2003 (=“CHP”)\*\*  
Beaney, M. (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of the History of Analytic Philosophy*, OUP, 2013 (=“OHAP”)\*\*  
Dainton, B., Robinson, H. (eds.), *The Bloomsbury Companion to Analytic Philosophy*, Bloomsbury, 2013 (=“BCAP”)\*\*  
Friedman, M., Creath, R. (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Carnap*, CUP (=CC-C)\*\*  
Gibson, R.F. (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Quine*, CUP 2004 (=“CC-Q”)\*\*  
Glock, H.J. (ed.), *Wittgenstein. A Critical Reader*. Routledge, 2001 (=“WCR”)  
Glock, H.J., Hyman, J. (eds.) *A Companion to Wittgenstein*, Wiley-Blackwell, 2017 (=ACW) \*\*  
Griffin, N. (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Russell*, CUP, 2003 (=“CC-R”)\*\*  
Harman, G., LePore, E. (eds.) *A Companion to Quine*, Blackwell, 2014 (=“ACQ”)\*\*  
Martinich, A.P., Sosa, D. (eds.), *A Companion to Analytic Philosophy*. Blackwell, 2001 (=“ACA”)\*\*  
Moran, D. (ed.), *The Routledge Companion to Twentieth Century Philosophy*, Routledge, 2010 (=“RCTP”)\*\*  
Reck, E. (ed.), *From Frege to Wittgenstein*, OUP, 2002 (=“FW”)\*\*  
Potter, M., Ricketts, T. (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Frege*, CUP, 2010 (=“CC-F”)\*\*  
Richardson, A., Uebel, T. (eds), *The Cambridge Companion to Logical Empiricism*, CUP, 2007 (=“CC-LE”)\*\*  
Schilpp, P.A. (ed.), *The Philosophy of Rudolf Carnap*, Open Court, 1963,  
Sluga, H., Stern D. (eds.), *The Cambridge Companion to Wittgenstein*, CUP, 1996 (=CC-W)\*\*  
Soames, S., *Philosophical Analysis in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century. Vol.1: The Dawn of Analysis, Vol.2: The Age of Meaning*, Princeton, 2003. (=“PA1/PA2”)\*\* [Not an anthology, but detailed analyses of central texts]

## Journal Articles

Full names are given for all journals referred to below (available online at library) except for *Journal for the History of Analytical Philosophy* (=“JHAP” [free access internet journal]).

## GUIDE TO WEEKLY READINGS

Please note that papers or chapters listed under “Readings A” are the main primary sources from the reading for the tutorials will be taken (for details and study questions see relevant Blackboard page).

Papers or chapters listed under “Readings B” are further primary source materials that are recommended for study to help you deepen your understanding of the issues and debates covered, esp. for purposes of course work and exam preparation.

Readings listed under “Secondary Sources” provide either useful background information or helpful analyses of the primary materials studied.

Note that below “\*\*\*” means available on the course’s Blackboard page.

And “\*\*” continues means online availability at library.

### Week 1 Introduction. Philosophical Modernism and its Critics.

#### Background:

Skorupski, J., *English-Language Philosophy 1830-1945*, OUP, 1994, (Chs. 5-6) 129-218.

Ryle, G. (ed.), *The Revolution in Philosophy*, OUP, 1956.

Dummett, M., *The Origins of Analytic Philosophy*, Duckworth, 1993.

Hacker, P.M.S., “The Rise of 20C Analytic Philosophy.” *Ratio* 9 (1996) 243-268.\*\*

Skorupski, J., “Why Did Language Matter to Analytic Philosophy?” *Ratio* 9 (1996) 267-283.\*\*

van Heijenoort, J., “Logic as Language and Logic as Calculus.” *Synthese* 17 (1967) 324-330.\*\*

Goldfarb, W., “Logic in the Twenties.” *Journal of Symbolic Logic* 44 (1979) 351-368.\*\*

Awodey, S., Carus, A., “The Turning Point and the Revolution.” In CC-LE 165-292.\*\*

Galison, P., “Aufbau/Bauhaus: Logical Positivism+Arch. Modernism.” *Critical Inquiry* 16(1990)709-752.\*\*

Wartofsky, M., “Positivism and Politics. Vienna Circle as Social Movement.” *GPS* 16/17 (1982) 79-101.

### Week 2 Frege. Thought and Sense: Meaning and the Philosophical Critique of Psychologism.

#### Reading A:

Frege, G., “The Thought .” *Mind* 65 (1956) 289-311\*\* / *The Frege Reader* (Beaney, ed.), Blackwell, Oxford, 1996 (=“FR”), 325-345\*\*\* / AP 19-31

Frege, G., “Sense and Reference.” In FR 151-172 / *Frege Translations from the Philosophical Writings* (Black and Geach, eds.). Blackwell. 1952/80 (=“PW”), 56-78\*\*\* / AP 7-18

#### Reading B:

Frege, G., “Comments on Sinn and Bedeutung.” In FR 172-180.

Frege, G., “Function and Concept.” In FR 130-148\*\*\* / PW 21-41

Frege, G., “Extracts from Review of Husserl, *Philosophie der Arithmetik*.” In PW 79-85

#### Secondary Sources

Husserl, Frege, Chisholm on Psychologism in Solomon, R.(ed.), *Phenomenology and Existentialism*, Rowman & Littlefield, Savage, 1972, 61-99, 106-109.

Kusch, M., *Psychologism*, Routledge, 1995, 30-62.

Gabriel, G., “Frege, Lotze, and the Continental Roots of Analytic Philosophy.” In FW 39-51.\*\*

Gabriel, G., “Frege and German Background to Analytic Philosophy.” In OHAP 280-297.\*\*

Kenny, A., *Frege*, Penguin, 1994 / Wiley-Blackwell, 2000, chs, 6,7, and 10.  
 Weiner, J., *Frege*, Oxford, 1999, chs. 5-6.  
 Beaney, M., "Introduction", in Beaney (ed.), *The Frege Reader*, Blackwell, 1996  
 Kremer, M., "Sense and Reference: Origins and Development of the Distinction." In CC-F 220-292.\*\*  
 Makin, G., "Frege's Distinction of Sense and Reference." *Philosophy Compass* 5 (2010) 147-163.\*\*  
 Perry, J., "Frege on Demonstratives", *Philosophical Review* 86 (1977) 474-497 \*\*  
 Burge, T., *Truth, Thought and Reason*, OUP, 2005, 27-35, 213-241, 299-316.\*\*  
 Dummett, M., "Frege's Myth of the 3<sup>rd</sup> Realm." In *Frege and Other Philosophers*, OUP, 1996, 1-15.\*\*  
 Ricketts, T., "Objectivity + Objecthood." In L. Haaparanta, J. Hintikka (eds.), *Frege Synthesized*, Dordrecht, 1986, 65-95  
 Rousse, S., "Demythologizing the 3<sup>rd</sup> Realm." *JHAP* 3.1 (2013) 1-15.\*\*  
 Burge, T., "Gottlob.Frege: Some Form of Influence." In OHAP 355-382.\*\*

### **Week 3 Russell. Knowledge by Acquaintance & Description: the External World Programme.**

#### Reading A:

Russell, B., "Descriptions." In Russell, *Introduction to Mathematical Philosophy*, Allen & Unwin, 1919, 167-180 \*\*\* / CAP 15-24 / AT 145-155  
 Russell, B., "Knowledge by Acquaintance and Description." In Russell, *Problems of Philosophy*, OUP, 1912/1979, 25-32 \*\*\* / AP, 185-189.

#### Reading B:

Russell, B., "On Denoting." In *Mind* 14 (1905) 479-493\*\* / MS, 32-40 / Russell, *Logic and Knowledge*, Routledge, 1956, 39-57 \*\*\*  
 Russell, B., "Knowledge by Acquaintance and Knowledge by Description." In Russell, *Mysticism and Logic*, Routledge, 1917/1963, 200-221. (More expansive than chapter from *PoP*)  
 Russell, B., "On Our Knowledge of the External World." In Russell, *Our Knowledge of the External World*, Routledge, 1914/1993, 70-105. \*\*\*  
 Russell, B., "The Relation of Sense-Data to Physics ." In *Mysticism and Logic*, 145-172 \*\*\*

#### Secondary Sources

Sainsbury, M., *Russell*, Routledge, 1979, ch. 4 .  
 Ayer, A. J. *Russell and Moore. The Analytical Heritage*, Macmillan, 1971, chs. 2 and 4.  
 Griffin, N., "Russell and Moore's Revolt Against British Idealism." In OHAP 383-406. \*\*  
 Strawson, P.F., "On Referring." *Mind* 59 (1950) 320-344\*\* / AP 41-54 / CAP ...  
 Russell, B., "Mr. Strawson on Referring." *Mind* 66 (1957) 385-389 \*\* / CAP  
 Donellan, K., "Reference and Definite Descriptions." *Philosophical Review* 75 (1966) 281-304 \*\*  
 Hylton, P., "The Theory of Descriptions." In CC-R 202-240.\*\*  
 Soames, S., "Logical Form and Theory of Descriptions", "Logical constructions and the External World." In PA1 93-131, 165-181. \*\*  
 Hylton, P., "Frege and Russell." In CC-F 509-549. \*\*  
 Beaney, M., "Russell and Frege." In CC-R 128-170. \*\*  
 Linksy, B. , "Russell's Theory of Description and Idea of Logical Construction." In OHAP 407-429. \*\*  
 Baldwin, T., "From Knowledge by Acquaintance to Knowledge by Causation." In CC-R 420-448. \*\*  
 Linksy, B., "The Metaphysics of Logical Atomism." In CC-R 371-391. \*\*

Stevens, G., *The Russellian Origins of AP*, Routledge, 2005, 90-127

Bach, K., "Comparing Frege and Russell." <http://online.sfsu.edu/kbach/FregeRus.html>

Kripke, S. "Speaker's Reference and Semantic Reference", *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* (2) 255-276  
[http://www.uvm.edu/~lдерosse/courses/lang/Kripke\(1977\).pdf](http://www.uvm.edu/~lдерosse/courses/lang/Kripke(1977).pdf)

#### **Week 4 Wittgenstein I. The *Tractatus*-Project: Logical Atomism and the Picture Theory**

##### Reading A:

Wittgenstein, L., "[Excerpts from] *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*." In AP 112-122. \*\*\* Slightly different selection in *The Wittgenstein Reader* (Kenny, ed) Blackwell, Oxford, 1994 (= "WR") 1-31.

##### Secondary Sources

Kenny, A., *Wittgenstein*, Blackwell-Wiley, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. 2006, chs. 2-4 \*\*

Anscombe, G.E.M., *An Introduction to Wittgenstein's Tractatus*, Hutchinson, 1959.

Fogelin, R., Part 1 of *Wittgenstein*, Routledge, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed 1987.

Ishiguro, H., "The so-called Picture Theory..." In WCR 26-46.

Mounce, H., "The Logical System of the *Tractatus*." In WCR 47-58

Hart, W.D., "The Real Sense of the *Tractatus*." *Journal of Philosophy* 68 (1971) 273-288. \*\*

Ricketts, T., "Pictures, Logic and the Limits of Sense in Wittgenstein's *Tractatus*." In CC-W 59-99. \*\*

Ricketts, T., "Wittgenstein against Frege and Russell." In FW 227-251. \*\*

Goldfarb, W., "Wittgenstein's Understanding of Frege" In FW 185-200. \*\*

Reck, E., "Wittgenstein's 'Great Debt' to Frege." In FW 3-38. \*\*

Kremer, M. "The Whole Meaning of a Book of Nonsense." In OHAP 451-485. \*\*

Glock, H.J., "The Development of Wittgenstein's Philosophy." In WCR 1-25 (esp.1-10).

Soames, S., "Metaphysics of Tr.", "Meaning Truth and Logic In Tr." In PA1 197-233. \*\*

Beaney, M., "Wittgenstein and Frege." In ACW 74-91 \*\*

Stevens, G., "Wittgenstein and Russell." In ACW 92-109 \*\*.

#### **Week 5 Logical Empiricism I. The Attack on Metaphysics.**

##### Reading A:

Schlick, M., "Turning Point in Philosophy." In LP 53-6 / Schlick, *Philosophical Papers* 2 (= "PP-S"), Reidel, 1979, 154-160 \*\*\*.

Carnap, R., "The Elimination of Metaphysics through Logical Analysis of Language." In LP, 60-81 \*\*\*

##### Reading B:

Carnap, R., "Pseudoproblems in Philosophy." In *Logical Structure of World*, Calif UP, 1967, 305-343 \*\*\*

Carnap/Hahn/Neurath, "The Scientific Conception of the World." In Neurath, *Empiricism and Sociology* (Neurath, Cohen, eds), Kluwer, 1973, 299-318. \*\*\*

Frank, P., "Physical Theories and School Philosophy." In *Modern Science and its Philosophy*, Harvard, 1949, 90-121.

##### Secondary Sources

Waismann, F., "Theses." In WVC 233-261

H. Feigl, H. Blumberg, "Logical Positivism." *Journal of Philosophy* 28 (1931) 281-296. \*\*

Uebel, T., "Wittgenstein and the Vienna Circle." In ACW 699-717. \*\*.

Stern, D., "Wittgenstein, the Vienna Circle, Physicalism: A Reassessment." In CC-LE 305-331. \*\*

Pincock, C., "Carnap, Russell and the External World." In CC-C 106-128. \*\*

## **Week 6 Logical Empiricism II. The Attack on Empirical Foundations of Knowledge**

### Reading A:

Neurath, O., "Protocol Sentences ." In LP, 199-209 / RLP 160-168 / Neurath, *Philosophical Papers*, (= "PP-N"), Reidel, 1983, 91-98 \*\*\*

Schlick, M., "The Foundation of Knowledge." In LP 209-227 / RLP 178-195 \*\*\* / PP-S 370-387

### Reading B:

Neurath, O., "Sociology in Physicalism (sects.1-2)." In LP 282-293 / PP-N 58-68 \*\*\*

Carnap, R., "On Protocol Sentences ." *Nous* 21 (1987) 457-470. \*\*

Schlick, M., "Introduction", "On Affirmations." PP-S 405-413 \*\*\*

Neurath, O. "Radical Physicalism and the 'Real World'." In PP-N 100-114,

Carnap, R., "The Physical Language as the Universal Language of Science." In W.P. Alston, G. Nakhnikian (eds.), *Readings in 20th-Century Philosophy*, Free Press, Glencoe, 1963, 393-424.

Carnap, R. "Psychology in Physical Language." In LP 165-196.

Carnap, R., "Testability and Meaning." In *Philosophy of Science* 3-4 (1936/7) 419-471, 1-40 \*\* / CAP 130-196

### Secondary Sources

Uebel, T., "Carnap and the Vienna Circle: Rational Reconstructionism Refined." In CC-C 153-175. \*\*

Uebel, T., "Neurath's Protocol Statements Revisited." *Studies in History and Philosophy of Science* 40 (2009) 4-13. \*\*

Uebel, T., *Empiricism at the Crossroads. On Protocol-Sentence Debate*, Open Court 2007, Chs.6-11 \*\*.

## **Week 7 Wittgenstein II. Beyond Logical Atomism: Meaning as Use.**

### Reading A:

Wittgenstein, L., "Excerpts from *Blue and Brown Books* and *Philosophical Grammar*" In WR 56-66 \*\*\* / AP 497-510 (longer from BB).

Wittgenstein, L., "*Philosophical Investigations*: §§143-219 and 243-314." \*\* In WR 87-103 (=§§143-219), 141-157 (=§§243-314 / AT 310-327)

### Reading B:

Wittgenstein, L., "[Excerpts] The Rejection of Logical Atomism ." In WR 40-43, 46-49. \*\*\*

Waismann, F., *Wittgenstein and the Vienna Circle*, Blackwell, 1979, 45-47, 73-79.

Baker, G., *The Voices of Wittgenstein*, Blackwell, 2000, 3-29, 117-127, 217-231, 245-261.

Moore, G.E., "Wittgenstein's Lectures 1930-33." In *Mind* 63 (1954) 1-15. 289-315, 64 (1955) 1-27. 264. \*\* / CAP 233-284.

### Secondary Sources

Kenny, A. Chapters 6-10 of *Wittgenstein* = KW \*\*

Glock, H.J., "The Development of Wittgenstein's Philosophy." In WCR 1-25 (esp.10-22).

Malcolm, N., *Nothing is Hidden. Wittgenstein's Criticism of his Early Thought*. Blackwell, 1986.

Fogelin, R., Chapters 9 and 13 of *Wittgenstein* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.), Routledge, 1987.

Fogelin, R. "Private Language..Argument One More Time", in Ellis, Guevara (eds.) *Wittgenstein and the Philosophy of Mind*, OUP, 2013, Ch. 5. \*\*

Hintikka, M.B., Hintikka, J., *Investigating Wittgenstein*. Blackwell, 1986, Ch. 6.

Stern, D., "The Middle Wittgenstein." *Synthese* 87 (1991) 203-226. \*\*

Stern, D., *Wittgenstein on Mind and Language*, OUP, 1995, 91-140, 175-186. \*\*

Stern, D., "The Uses of Wittgenstein's Beetle." In Kahane, Kantenian, Kuusela (eds), *Wittgenstein and his Interpreters*, Blackwell, 2013, 248-268.

Lüdeking, K., "Sraffa's Gesture." In Weinberger, Koller, Schramm (eds), *Philosophy of Law, Politics, and Society*, HPT, Vienna, 1988, 413-418.

Hacker, P.M.S., *Connections and Controversies*, Clarendon Press, 2001, 141-169. \*\*

McGinn, M., *Wittgenstein and the Philosophical Investigations*, Routledge, 1997, Chs. 3-4.

Williams, M., *Wittgenstein, Mind and Meaning*, Routledge, 1999, Chs. 1-2.

Budd, M., *Wittgenstein's Philosophy of Psychology*, 1989, Ch.3.

## **Week 8 Logical Empiricism III. Critique of Verificationism and Reductionism.**

### Reading A:

Ayer, A.J., "[Excerpt from] Introduction to 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition." In *Language, Truth and Logic*, Gollancz, 1936, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. 1946, 5-16 \*\*\* / RLP 55-60 / CAP 121-129

Hempel, C.G., "Empiricist Criteria of Cognitive Significance: Problems and Changes." In Hempel, *Aspects of Scientific Explanation*, Free Press, 1965, 101-122. \*\*\*

### Reading B:

Ayer, A.J., "Elimination of Metaphysics." In *Language Truth Logic*, 33-45 / AP 418-424.

Carnap, R., "The Methodological Character of Theoretical Concepts." In Feigl, Scriven (eds), *The Foundations of Science*, U of Minnesota Press, 1956, 38-76

### Secondary Sources

Rynin, D., "Vindication of L\*G\*C\*L P\*S\*T\*V\*SM." In RLP 60-80.

Soames, S., "Rise and Fall of Empiricist Criterion of Meaning." In PA1 271-299. \*\*

Justus, J., "Carnap's Forgotten Criterion of Empirical Significance." *Mind* 123 (2014) 415-430. \*\*

Uebel, T., "Beyond Formalist Meaning Criterion: Frank's Later Antimetaphysics." *HOPOS* 1 (2011) 47-72

Crawford, S., "The Myth of Logical Behaviorism." In OHAP 621-656. \*\*

Uebel, T., "Early Logical Empiricism and its Reception. The Case of the Vienna Circle." In OHAP 518-545. \*\*

Misak, C.J., *Verificationism. Its History and Prospects*, Routledge, 1995, Chs. 2-3.

## **Week 9 Quine I: The Challenge of "Two Dogmas of Empiricism"**

### Reading A:

Quine, W.V.O., "Two Dogmas of Empiricism." In *Philosophical Review* 60 (1951) 20-40\*\* / Quine, *From a Logical Point of View*, Harvard 1953 (= "LPV") 29-46 \*\*\*/ AP 450-62 /CAP186-213

Grice, P., Strawson, P., "In Defense of a Dogma." *Philosophical Review* 65 (1956) 141-151\*\* / AP 463-472 \*\*\* / CAP 340-352

### Reading B:

- Carnap, R., "Quine on Analyticity". In Creath (ed.), *Dear Carnap, Dear Van*, California UP, 1990, 427-430. \*\*\*
- Carnap, R., "Meaning Postulates." *Philosophical Studies* 3 (1952) 65-73 \*\* / Carnap, *Meaning and Necessity*, Chicago UP, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed 1956 (= "MN") 222-229.
- Carnap, R., "Meaning and Synonymy in Natural Languages." *Philosophical Studies* 7 (1955) 33-47 \*\* / MN 233-247
- Quine, W.V.O., "Carnap and Logical Truth." In PRC 385-406 / Quine, *Ways of Paradox*, Harvard, 1966/76 (= "WOP"), 107-132
- Carnap, R., "W.V. Quine on Logical Truth." In PRC 915-922.
- Quine, W.V.O., "Truth by Convention." In WOP 77-106. \*\*
- Secondary Sources (and one very early primary one)
- Creath, R., "Every Dogma Has its Day." *Erkenntnis* 35, 347-389. \*\*
- Creath, R., "Vienna, City of Quine's Dreams." In CC-LE 332-345. \*\*
- Creath, R., "Quine's Challenge to Carnap.." In CC-C 316-335. \*\*
- Creath, R., "Quine on Intelligibility and Relevance of Analyticity." In CC-Q 47-65. \*\*
- Russell, G., "Quine on the Analytic/Synthetic Distinction." In ACQ 181-202 \*\*
- Soames, S., "Analytic, Synthetic, Necessary, Possible, Apriori, Aposteriori." In PA 1 351-377. \*\*
- Richardson, A., "Two Dogmas about Logical Empiricism.", *Philosophical Topics* 25 {1997} 154-168 \*\*
- Awodey, S., "Carnap's Quest for Analyticity.." In CC-C 226-247. \*\*
- Isaacson, D., "Quine and Logical Positivism." In CC-Q 214-269.
- Juhl, C., Loomis, E., *Analyticity*, Routledge, 2010, 30-128. \*\*
- Glock, H.J., *Quine and Davidson on Thought, Language, Reality*. CUP, 2003, 70-101\*\*
- Hellman, G., "Logical Truth by Linguistic Convention. (with a "Reply" by Quine)." In Hahn, Schilpp (eds.), *The Philosophy of W.V. Quine*, 1986, 189-208.

## **Week 10 Quine II. Naturalism and the Possibility of Metaphysics**

### Reading A:

- Quine, W.V.O., "On What There Is." *Review of Metaphysics* 2 (1948) 21-38 \*\* / LPV 1-19 / AP 135-143.
- Carnap, R., "Empiricism, Semantics, Ontology." *Revue Internationale de Philosophie* 4 (1950) 20-40\*\* / MN 205-221 \*\*\* / AP 925-935.

### Reading B:

- Quine, W.V.O., "Carnap's Views on Ontology." *Philosophical Studies* 2(1951)65-72\*\*/ WOP 203-211 \*\*\*
- Quine, W.V., "Epistemology Naturalized." In *Ontological Relativity*, Harvard, 1969, 69-90 \*\*\* / AP 225-33.

### Background:

- Stein, H., "Was Carnap Entirely Wrong After All?" *Synthese* 93 (1992) 275-296. \*\*
- Hylton, P., "Quine on Reference and Ontology." In CC-Q 115-150. \*\*
- Alspector-Kelly, M., "On Quine on Carnap on Ontology", *Philosophical Studies* 103 (2001) 93-122\*\*
- Soames, S., "Ontology, Analyticity, Meaning." In Chalmers (ed), *Metametaphysics*, OUP, 2009, 424-443.\*\*
- Creath, R., "Carnap and Ontology." In Lapointe, Blatti (eds), *Ontology After Carnap*, OUP, 2016, 190-9.
- Ricketts, T., "Rationality, Translation, Epistemology Naturalized." *Journal of Philosophy* 79 (1982) 117-136. \*\*

Hylton, P., "Quine's Naturalism Revisited." In ACQ 148-162.\*\*  
 Ebbs, G., "Quine's Naturalism and Carnap's Logic of Science." In ACQ 465-480\*\*  
 Glock, H.J., *Quine and Davidson on Thought, Language, Reality*. CUP, 2003, 40-70\*\*  
 Juhl, C., Loomis, E., *Analyticity*, Routledge, 2010, 129-173. \*\*  
 Cartwright, R., "Ontology and the Theory of Meaning", *Philosophy of Science* 21 (1954) 316-325\*\*

## **Week 11. Moore and Wittgenstein. The limits of certainty: two responses to skepticism.**

### Reading A:

Moore, G.E., "Proof of an External World." In Moore, *Selected Writings* (Baldwin, ed), Routledge, 1993, 147-170 (= "SW") \*\*\* / Moore, *Philosophical Papers*, 1959, 140-155 (= "PP"). CAP 68-84 / AP ...  
 Wittgenstein, L., "[Excerpts from] On Certainty." In WR 245-260 / AP 171-184 (compl.to no.201) \*\*\*

### Reading B:

Moore, G.E., "In Defense of Common Sense." In SW 106-133. / CAP 47-67 / AT 98-122  
 Moore, G.E., "Certainty." In SW 171-196 / PP ... / AP 155-170

### Background:

Baldwin, T., "Moore and the Cambridge School of Analysis" In OHAP 430-450. \*\*  
 Baldwin, T., "Wittgenstein and Moore", in Kuusela, McGinn (eds), *Oxford Handbook of Wittgenstein*, OUP, 2009, 524-549. \*\*  
 Kenny, A., *Wittgenstein*, Blackwell-Wiley, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. 2006, ch. 11 \*\*  
 Pritchard, D., "Wittgenstein on Scepticism." In Kuusela, McGinn (eds), *Oxford Handbook of Wittgenstein*, OUP, 2009, 524-549. \*\*  
 Haller, R., "Justification and Praxeological Foundationalism", *Inquiry* 31 (1998) 335-345.  
 Williams, M., "Why Wittgenstein Isn't a Foundationalist." In Mayal-Sharrock, Brennan (eds.), *Reading Wittgenstein's On Certainty*, Macmillan, 2005, 47-58  
 Soames, S., "Moore on Skepticism, Perception and Knowledge." In PA1 12-33. \*\*  
 Wright, C., "Facts and Certainty." *Proceedings of the British Academy* 71 (1985) 429-472.\*\*  
 Wright, C., "Scepticism, Certainty, Moore and Wittgenstein", in M. Kölbel, B. Weiss (eds.), *Wittgenstein's Lasting Significance*, Routledge, 2004, 226-242.  
 Pryor, J., "What's Wrong with Moore's Argument?" *Philosophical Perspectives* 14 (2004) 349-375. \*\*  
 Coliva, A. "The Paradox of Moore's Proof." *Philosophical Quarterly* 58 (2008) 234-243. \*\*  
 Korber, M., "Certainties of a World-Picture." In CC-W 411-441. \*\*  
 Grayling, A., "Wittgenstein on Scepticism and Certainty." In WCR 305-321.\*\*

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES  
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

**PHILOSOPHY**

**COURSE UNIT OUTLINE 2018-19**

|  |
|--|
| <b>PHIL20231 Ethics</b><br><b>Semester: 1    Credits: 20</b> |
|--|

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

**Lecturer(s):** Dr Paula Satne  
**Office:** Humanities Bridgeford Street, 2.45  
**Telephone:** 0161 275 4777  
**Email:** [paula.satne@manchester.ac.uk](mailto:paula.satne@manchester.ac.uk)  
**Office Hours:** Wednesday 10-11 am  
Thursday 14-15 pm

Please email to arrange an appointment outside of these hours.

**Tutors:** Emile Chan, Fred Horton, and Penelope Orr  
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](mailto:christopher.ashworth@manchester.ac.uk)

**Lectures:** Wednesday 11-1pm

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

**Assessment:** 2 hour exam                  67%  
2,000 word essay              33%

**Reading Week:** Monday 29<sup>th</sup> 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.

|                          |      |
|--------------------------|------|
| <b>Pre-requisite(s):</b> | None |
|--------------------------|------|

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

**Examination period:** Monday 14 January – Friday 25 January 2019

## **2. ABOUT THE COURSE**

### **Summary**

Some of the central ethical questions that we will cover in this course are: (i) which sorts of things are of ethical value and disvalue? (people? their actions? their intentions? their characters? the situations that they get themselves into?), (ii) what does their possessing this value demand of us? (e.g. that we bring about the greatest happiness of the greatest number? that we treat others as ends, not means? that we do unto others as we would have them do unto us?), (iii) how do these demands motivate our actions (e.g. by arousing our passions, or our reason?), and (iv) why does it matter to us that these demands are met (i.e. why do we care about the demands that are made by morality)?, (v) what is blame? And when are we justified in blaming?, (vi) what is complicity morally wrong?, (vii) can we ever justify torture?

### **Aims**

The course aims to:

- Guide students' development in thinking philosophically about ethics.
- Familiarise students with some important writings in contemporary philosophical ethics.
- Enhance students' ability to present and discuss philosophical issues orally, and their ability to present philosophical ideas and arguments in written work.

### **Learning Outcomes**

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

- Knowledge and understanding of some of the main texts and ideas in contemporary ethics.
- The ability to critically engage with these texts and ideas.
- The ability to present and discuss orally the examined ideas.
- The ability to present in writing clear, cogent, sustained philosophical arguments, based on relevant background research.

## **3. COURSE ORGANISATION**

**Lectures:** Wednesday 11-1pm

**Tutorials:**

| <b>DAY &amp; TIME</b> | <b>LOCATION</b>         | <b>TEACHING ASSISTANT</b> |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Fri 9-10am            | Uni Place_6.208         | F.Horton                  |
| Thur 1-2pm            | Crawford House_SEM RM D | P.Orr                     |
| Thur 2-3pm            | Crawford House_SEM RM D | P.Orr                     |
| Thur 3-4pm            | Crawford House_SEM RM D | E.Chan                    |
| Thur 4-5pm            | Crawford House_SEM RM D | E.Chan                    |
| Tue 12-1pm            | Crawford House_SEM RM C | F.Horton                  |
| Tue 1-2pm             | Crawford House_SEM RM C | F.Horton                  |
| Tue 2-3pm             | Crawford House_SEM RM C | F.Horton                  |
| Tue 3-4pm             | Crawford House_SEM RM C | F.Horton                  |

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 tutorial 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, Christopher Ashworth as soon as possible – if possible, *before* the tutorial. group without permission.

### ***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:

None. Reading lists of materials accessible online and/or through the library will be provided.

**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, <http://www.socialsciences.manchester.ac.uk/student-intranet/undergraduate/course-information/philosophy/> 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 two, 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 2,000 words, 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. The marker is not obliged to read any more than the number of words specified above and may ignore any additional material if they choose.

### 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.

### 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*, available from the Philosophy intranet site. **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

PHIL20231 Ethics 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.** All essays are marked anonymously; please do not put your name on the filename or anywhere in the essay.

***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 **27 November 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 PHIL20232 Ethics. 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); and obtaining feedback from your peers during tutorials, and through discussion boards and the like.

## Assessed Essay Titles

Choose one question from those listed below:

"The idea of maximum welfare...in the guise of 'the best outcome' [does not stand] *outside* morality as its foundation and arbiter..." (Foot). Is this correct?

"An action is right iff it is what a virtuous agent would characteristically (i.e. acting in character) do in the circumstances" (Hursthouse). Is this correct?

Are benefit and harm the only relevant moral considerations?

Imagine that you face a choice between saving the life of one stranger, and saving the life of five strangers. You firmly believe, with Kant, that everyone is an end in themselves, with absolute dignity. What, by the lights of this belief, should you do?

## 5. COURSE OUTLINE

Week 1 (beginning 24th Sep): Goodness

Week 2 (beginning 1<sup>st</sup> Oct): Virtue

Week 3 (beginning 8<sup>th</sup> Oct): Benefit and Harm

Week 4 (beginning 15<sup>th</sup> Oct): Dignity and Respect

Week 5 (beginning 22<sup>nd</sup> Oct): Wrongness (according to Scanlon)

Week 6 (beginning 29<sup>th</sup> Oct): **Reading Week (no lectures or tutorials)**

Week 7 (beginning 5<sup>th</sup> Nov.): Wrongness (according to Kant)

Week 8 (beginning 12<sup>th</sup> Nov): Blame

Week 9 (beginning 19<sup>th</sup> Nov): Collective Wrongdoing

Week 10 (beginning 26<sup>th</sup> Nov): Complicity

Week 11 (beginning 3<sup>rd</sup> Dec): Torture

Week 12 (beginning 10<sup>th</sup> Dec): Revision

**\*\*Lectures begin in Week 1 and tutorials begin in Week 2\*\***

## 6. READING LIST

### Resources

You study in three ways: by attending lectures, participating in tutorials, and reading.

Blackboard will give week-by-week **mandatory** reading for the week's tutorial. Below I provide week-by-week lists of **recommended readings** on the theme of the lectures and the accompanying tutorials. It is essential that you follow at least some of these recommendations for private reading if you want to get most out of the course, and have the best possible chance of high achievement in your assessed essay and exam. But be aware that no reading list is exhaustive: you are encouraged to find your own texts to read by following up footnotes, browsing real and virtual libraries etc.

Almost all of the texts on the recommended reading lists are either held in the library or accessible on-line. Some additional useful on-line browsing resources include:

*Ethical theory: an anthology* Wiley-Blackwell

*The Blackwell Guide to Ethical Theory* (especially Part II: Normative ethics)

*The Oxford Handbook of Ethical Theory* (especially Part II: Normative ethical theory)

Each can be accessed online by searching on the library search engine

<http://www.library.manchester.ac.uk/>

To access on-line resources, it is easiest to use the search engines located at

*University of Manchester Library*

<http://www.library.manchester.ac.uk/>

PhilPapers

<http://philpapers.org/>

Google scholar

<http://scholar.google.co.uk/>

Sometimes, if you are not on campus, you will need to look for a tab called 'Institutional Log-in (Shibboleth)' select University of Manchester, and then give your user-name and password. This is because the relevant on-line resource has subscription only access.

## **WEEK-BY-WEEK READING LIST**

### **WEEK 1: GOODNESS**

#### **Tutorial text (mandatory):**

Foot, P. "Utilitarianism and the Virtues", *Mind*, 94 (374) (1985): 196-209.

#### **Further readings:**

Arneson R. J. (2010) 'Good, period' *Analysis* Vol. 70, No. 4 pp. 731–744.

Foot P. (2002) *Natural Goodness* Oxford: OUP. See especially ch. 2.

Foot P. (1985) 'Utilitarianism and the Virtues' *Mind* Vol. 94, No. 374 pp. 196-209.

\*Geach P. T. (1956) 'Good and Evil' *Analysis*, Vol. 17, No. 2 pp. 33-42.

Thomson J. J. (1997) 'The Right and the Good' *The Journal of Philosophy*, Vol. 94, No. 6 pp. 273-298.

\*Thomson, J. J. (2008) "Goodness" in *Normativity* (Open Court, 2008). (text available on Blackboard)

Sinnott-Armstrong W. (2003) 'For Goodness' Sake' *Southern Journal of Philosophy* Vol. XLI pp. 83-91.

von Wright G. H. (1963) *The Varieties of Goodness* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.  
Available online at: [www.giffordlectures.org/lectures/varieties-goodness](http://www.giffordlectures.org/lectures/varieties-goodness)

Wiggins D. (2009) 'What is the Order Among the Varieties of Goodness? A Question Posed by von Wright; and a Conjecture Made by Aristotle' *Philosophy* Vol. 84 pp. 175-200.

Zimmerman M. J. (1999) 'In Defense of the Concept of Intrinsic Value' *Canadian Journal of Philosophy*, Vol. 29, No. 3 pp. 389-409.

### **WEEK 2: VIRTUE**

#### **Tutorial text (mandatory):**

Hursthouse, R. 'Normative Virtue Ethics' in Russ Shafer-Landau (ed.) *Ethical Theory: An Anthology*, Second Edition (John Wiley & Sons, 2013). (available on Blackboard)

#### **Further readings:**

Annas J. (2006) 'Virtue Ethics' D. Copp (ed.) *Oxford Handbook of Ethical Theory* Oxford: OUP  
See also her book *Intelligent Virtue* (2011) Oxford: OUP.

Aristotle *Nicomachean Ethics* (various editions and translations).

Das R. (2003) 'Virtue Ethics and Right Action', *Australasian Journal of Philosophy*, 81:3, 324-339.

Doris J. (1998) 'Persons, Situations and Virtue Ethics' *Nous* Vol. 32:4 pp. 504-30.

Driver J. (1996) 'The Virtues and Human Nature' in R. Crisp (ed.) *How Should One Live?*  
Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Foot P. (1978) 'Virtues and Vices' in her *Virtues and Vices and Other Essays in Moral Philosophy*  
Oxford: Basil Blackwell. Reprinted in various collections.

Harman G. (1999) 'Moral Philosophy Meets Social Psychology: Virtue Ethics and the fundamental attribution Error' *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* Vol. CXIX pp. 316-31.

Hurka T. (2001) 'Against Virtue Ethics' which is ch. 8 of his book *Virtue, Vice and Value* Oxford: OUP.

Hursthouse R. (2006) 'Are Virtues the Proper Starting Point for Morality?', and Driver J. (2006) 'Virtue Theory', both in J. Drier (ed.) *Contemporary Debates in Moral Theory* Oxford: Blackwell.

Hursthouse R. (1999) *On Virtue Ethics* Oxford: OUP.

Johnson R. N. (2003) 'Virtue and Right' *Ethics* Vol. 113, No. 4 pp. 810-834

McDowell J. (1979) 'Virtue and Reason' *Monist* Vol. 62, pp. 331–50. Also in *Mind, Value and Reality* Cambridge, Mass.: HUP (a collection of McDowell's papers).

Slote M. (1995) 'Agent-Based Virtue Ethics' *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* Vol. 20. Also in S. Darwall (ed.) (2003) *Virtue Ethics* Oxford: Blackwell, and in various other collections too.

Sreenivasan G. (2002) 'Errors about Errors: Virtue Theory and Trait Attribution' *Mind* Vol. 111 pp. 47-

Swanton C. (2003) *Virtue Ethics: A Pluralistic View* Oxford: OUP.

Swanton C. (2001) 'A virtue ethical account of right action' *Ethics* Vol. 112 pp. 32-52.

Trianosky G. (1986) 'Supererogation, Wrongdoing, and Vice' *Journal of Philosophy* Vol. 83. Also in Rachels J. (ed.) *Ethical Theory 2: Theories about How We Should Live* Oxford: OUP  
(and in the double-volume edition called simply *Ethical Theory*).

Watson G. (1990) 'On the Primacy of Character', in A. O. Rorty et al (eds.) *Identity, Character and Morality* Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press. Also in D. Statman (ed.) (1997) *Virtue Ethics*  
Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press. Also in S. Darwall (ed.) (2003) *Virtue Ethics*  
Oxford: Blackwell.

### WEEK 3: BENEFIT AND HARM

**Tutorial text** (mandatory):

Kraut, Richard, *What Is Good and Why* (Harvard University Press, 2009), sections 4 and 11-12.  
(links available on Blackboard)

### **Further readings:**

*On what is good for us.*

Crisp R. 'Well-Being' *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*  
<http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2013/entries/well-being>

Feldman F. (2006) *Pleasure and the Good Life*. OUP.

Griffin J. (1986) *Well-Being* Oxford: OUP. Part One.

Kraut R. (2007) *What is Good and Why: the ethics of well-being* Harvard Press.

Parfit D. (1984) *Reasons and Persons* Oxford: OUP Appendix I 'What makes someone's life go best'.

At <http://philosophyfaculty.ucsd.edu/faculty/rarneson/Courses/PARFITwhatmakesbest.pdf>

Scanlon T. M. 1998. *What We Owe to Each Other* Harvard Press. Ch. 3 'Well-Being'

*On what is good (full stop) and what is good for us.*

Almotahari M. & Hosein A. (2015) 'Is anything just plain good?' *Philosophical Studies* 172: 1485.

Campbell M. (2015) 'Absolute Goodness: in defence of the useless and immoral' *Journal of Value Inquiry* 49: pp. 95-112.

Fletcher G. (2012) 'The locative analysis of 'Good For' formulated and defended' *Journal of Ethics and Social Philosophy* Vol. 6. No. 1 pp. 1-26.

Kraut R. (2012) *Against Absolute Goodness* Oxford: OUP

Korsgaard C. (2013) 'The Relational Nature of the Good' *Oxford Studies in Metaethics*, Vol. 8:1.

Rosati C. S. (2008) 'Objectivism and Relational Good' *Social Philosophy and Policy* 25 (1):314-49.

Zimmerman M. J. (2009) 'Understanding What's Good For Us' *Ethical Theory and Moral Practice* 12:429-439

*On measuring what is good, and what is good for us.*

Chang R. ed. 1997 *Incommensurability, Incomparability and Practical Reason* Harvard Uni Press.

Chang R. 2013 'Incommensurability (and incomparability)' In Hugh LaFollette (ed.), *The International Encyclopedia of Ethics*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Griffin J. 1986. *Well-Being* Oxford: OUP. Part Two Ch. 5.

### **WEEK 4: DIGNITY AND RESPECT**

#### **Tutorial text (mandatory):**

Taurek John M., "Should the Numbers Count?" *Philosophy & Public Affairs*, Vol. 6, No. 4 (Summer, 1977), pp. 293-316

### **Further readings:**

*On Kant*

Kant I. *Foundations of the Metaphysics of Morals* (sometimes translated as the *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*, not to be confused with his *Metaphysics of Morals*). Esp. sec. II.

- Korsgaard C. (1986) 'Kant's Formula of Humanity' *Kant-Studien* Vol.77(2), p.183-.
- Nyholm S. (2013) 'On Kant's idea of Humanity as an end in itself' *European Journal of Philosophy* Vol.24(2) pp.358-374.
- Parfit D. (2011) *On What Matters* Oxford: OUP Vol. 1 ch. 9. See also chs. 8 and 10.  
*If you search for this on the Library catalogue, you'll find an e-book version viewable online.*
- Sullivan R. (1989) *Immanuel Kant's Moral Theory* Cambridge: CUP Ch. 14.
- Wood A. (1999) *Kant's Ethical Thought* Cambridge: CUP ch. 4.
- Wood A. (1998) 'Humanity as an end in itself' in P. Guyer, (ed.) *Kant's Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals: Critical Essays*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield.
- On the moral significance, if any, of "saving the greater number"*
- Anscombe G. E. M. (1967) 'Who is wronged?' *Oxford Review* vol. 5 pp. 16-17.  
Available at <https://drive.google.com/file/d/0B9jIScR8SHVgTUxWQ2dVYmoyQUU/view>
- Hirose I. (2004) 'Aggregation and Numbers' *Utilitas* Vol. 16, No. 1, pp. 62-
- Otsuka M. (2006) 'Saving lives, moral theory, and the claims of individuals' *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 34.2 pp. 109-.
- Otsuka M. (2004) 'Skepticism about saving the greater number' *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 32.4 pp. 413- .
- Munoz-Dardé V. (2005) 'The distribution of numbers and the comprehensiveness of reasons' *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 105.2: pp. 207-.
- Timmermann J. (2004) 'The individualist lottery: how people count, but not their numbers' *Analysis* 64.2 pp. 106-.
- Wasserman D. et al (2006) 'The numbers problem' *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 34 (4) pp. 352-.

## WEEK 5: WRONGNESS ACCORDING TO SCANLON

### **Tutorial text (mandatory):**

Scanlon, T. M., "Chapter 5: Contractualism and Utilitarianism" in Amartya Sen and Bernard Williams (eds.) *Utilitarianism and Beyond* (CUP, 1982), pp. 103-128.  
(available on Blackboard- please ignore section iv)

### **Further readings:**

- Darwall S. (2002) 'Introduction' S. Darwall (ed.) *Contractarianism/Contractualism* Oxford: Blackwell.
- Frei T. (2008) 'The Redundancy Objection, and Why Scanlon is Not a Contractualist' pp. 47-65  
*Journal of Political Philosophy* Vol. 17 pp. 47-65.
- Hieronymi P. (2011) 'Of metaethics and motivation: The appeal of contractualism'. In R. Jay Wallace, Rahul Kumar & Samuel Richard Freeman (eds.), *Reasons and Recognition: Essays on the Philosophy of T. M. Scanlon*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Parfit D. (2011) *On What Matters* Oxford: OUP Vol. 1 ch. 15 'Contractualism'.  
*If you search for this on the Library catalogue, you'll find an e-book version viewable online.*

- Pettit P. (2006) 'Can Contract Theory Ground Morality?' in J. Drier (ed.) *Contemporary Debates in Moral Theory* Oxford: Blackwell pp. 77-96.
- Rawls J. (1971) *A Theory of Justice* various editions. Secs. 3, 4, 11, 20, 24, 26. These sections are collected in S. Darwall (ed.) *Contractarianism/Contractualism* Oxford: Blackwell.
- Ridge M. (2003) 'Contractualism and the new and improved redundancy objection' *Analysis* 63 No. 4 pp. 337-42.
- Scanlon T. (1998) *What We Owe to Each Other* Cambridge, Mass.: HUP. Ch. 5. See also ch. 4.
- Stratton-Lake P. (2003) 'Scanlon's contractualism and the redundancy objection' *Analysis* 63 No. 1 pp. 70–76.
- Wallace R. J. (2002) 'Scanlon's Contractualism' *Ethics* Vol. 112 pp. 429-70. See especially pp. 449 onwards: sec. III 'Moral Reasons' and sec. IV 'The Unity of Morality'.
- Watson G. (1998) 'Some considerations in favor of contractualism' in C. Morris, J. Coleman (eds.) *Rational commitment and morality* Cambridge CUP, also in S. Darwall (ed.) *Contractarianism/Contractualism* Oxford: Blackwell.

## WEEK 6: READING WEEK: NO LECTURE OR TUTORIALS

## WEEK 7: WRONGNESS ACCORDING TO KANT

### **Tutorial text** (mandatory):

Korsgaard, Christine "Kant's formula of universal law" *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* (1985) 66, no. 1-2: 24-47.

### **Further readings:**

- Dietrichson P. (1964) 'When is a Maxim Fully Universalisable?' *Kant-Studien* Vol. 55 pp. 143-70.
- Herman B. (1993) *The Practice of Moral Judgment* Cambridge, Mass.: HUP ch. 3.
- Kant I. *Foundations of the Metaphysics of Morals* (sometimes translated as *Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals*, not to be confused with his *Metaphysics of Morals*). Esp. sec. II.
- Korsgaard C. (1986) 'The Right to Lie: Kant on Dealing with Evil' *Philosophy and Public Affairs* Vol. 15 No. 4. Also in her (1996) *Creating the Kingdom of Ends* Cambridge: CUP.
- Nell O. (1975) *Acting on Principle: an Essay on Kantian Ethics* New York: Columbia University Press.
- O'Neill O. (1989) 'Consistency in Action' in her *Constructions of Reason: Explorations of Kant's Practical Philosophy* Cambridge: CUP. (In various other places too).  
(By the way, O. Nell and O. O'Neill are the same person...)
- Parfit D. (2011) *On What Matters* Oxford: OUP Vol. 1 ch. 12 'Universal Laws'.
- Sullivan R. (1994) *An Introduction to Kant's Ethics*. Cambridge: CUP. Ch. 3.

Sullivan R. (1989) *Immanuel Kant's Moral Theory* Cambridge: CUP Chs. 11-13.

Wood A. (1999) *Kant's Ethical Thought* Cambridge: CUP ch. 3.

## WEEK 8: BLAME

### **Tutorial text** (mandatory):

Fricker, Miranda, "What's the Point of Blame? A Paradigm Based Explanation, *NOUS* 50:1 (2016) 165–183.

### **Further readings:**

Arpaly N. (2002) *Unprincipled Virtue* Oxford: OUP Ch. 4 'Blame, Autonomy, and Problem Cases.'

Bell M. (2012) 'The Standing to Blame: A Critique' *Blame: Its Nature and Norms*, eds. Neal A. Tognazzini and D. Justin Coates, New York: Oxford University Press.

Coates D. J. & Tognazzini N. A. (2012) 'The Nature and Ethics of Blame' *Philosophy Compass* 7 (3):197-207.

Coates D. J. and Tognazzini N. A. (2012) 'The Contours of Blame' *Blame: Its Nature and Norms*, eds. Neal A. Tognazzini and D. Justin Coates, New York: Oxford University Press.

Feinberg J. (1970) *Doing and deserving* Princeton NJ: University Press. Chs. 4 and 8.

Fricker M. (2010) 'The Relativism of Blame and Williams's Relativism of distance' *Aristotelian Society Supplementary Volume* 84 (1):151-177.

Hieronymi P. (2007) 'Rational capacity as a condition on blame' *Philosophical Books* 48 (2).

Hieronymi P. (2004) 'The force and fairness of blame' *Philosophical Perspectives, Vol. 18(1)* pp. 115–148.

Kelly E. I. (2012) 'What is an Excuse?' *Blame: Its Nature and Norms*, eds. Neal A. Tognazzini and D. Justin Coates, New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 263-281

Kennett J. (2001) *Agency and Responsibility* Oxford: Clarendon Press. Ch. 7

Korsgaard C. (1992) 'Creating the Kingdom of Ends' *Philosophical Perspectives Vol. 6* and in her *Creating the Kingdom of Ends* Cambridge: CUP.

Mason M. (2011) 'Blame: Taking it Seriously' *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research Vol. 83* pp. 472-81.

Owens D. (2012) *Shaping the Normative Landscape* Oxford: OUP. Ch. 1 'Blame and guilt'.

Pickard H. (2013) 'Irrational blame' *Analysis* 73 (4): 613-626.

Scanlon T. M. (1998) *What We Owe to Each Other* ch. 6 secs. 4, 5 Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.

Scanlon T. M. (2008) *Moral Dimensions: Permissibility, Meaning, Blame* Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. Ch.4 'Blame'.

Sher G. (2007) *In Praise of Blame* OUP.

Smart J. J. C. (1961) 'Free will, praise and blame' *Mind Vol. 70*: 291-306.

- Smith A. M. (2012) 'Moral Blame and Moral Protest' *Blame: Its Nature and Norms*, eds. Neal A. Tognazzini and D. Justin Coates, New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 263-281
- Smith A. M. (2008) 'Control, responsibility, and moral assessment' *Philosophical Studies* 138:367–
- Smith A. M. (2007) 'On being responsible and holding responsible' *The Journal of Ethics* 11:465–
- Strawson P. F. (1974) 'Freedom and resentment' in his *Freedom and resentment and other essays* London: Methuen (Methuen, London). Collected in various other places too.
- Tognazzini N.A. (2013). 'Blameworthiness and the Affective Account of Blame' *Philosophia*:1-14.
- Velleman J. D. (2003) 'Don't Worry, Feel Guilty' in A. Hatzimoysis (ed.) *Philosophy and the Emotions* (Royal Institute of Philosophy Supplement No. 52) pp. 235–48. It is also collected in *Self to Self* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (a collection of Velleman's papers).
- Wallace R. J. (1994) *Responsibility and the Moral Sentiments* Cambridge, Mass.: HUP
- Watson G. (1996) 'Two faces of responsibility' *Philosophical Topics*, Vol. 24(2) pp. 227–248. Also in his *Agency and Answerability: Selected Essays* Oxford: OUP.
- Wolf S. (2011) 'Blame, Italian Style' In R. Jay Wallace, Rahul Kumar & Samuel Richard Freeman (eds.), *Reasons and Recognition: Essays on the Philosophy of T. M. Scanlon* Oxford: OUP.

## WEEK 9: COLLECTIVE WRONGDOING

### **Tutorial text** (mandatory):

Jackson, Frank "Chapter 6: Group Morality" in Philip Pettit et al *Metaphysics and Morality: Essays in Honour of J.J.C. Smart* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1987). (available on Blackboard)

### **Further readings:**

Entry on Collective Responsibility in Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy

<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/collective-responsibility/>

Björnsson, G (2011) 'Joint responsibility without individual control: Applying the Explanation Hypothesis'. In Jeroen van den Hoven, Ibo van de Poel & Nicole Vincent (eds.) *Compatibilist Responsibility: beyond free will and determinism*.

Collins S. (2013) 'Collectives' Duties and Collectivization Duties'. *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* 91/2: 231–248.

Copp D. (2007) 'The Collective Moral Autonomy Thesis' *Journal of Social Philosophy* 38(3) 369–.

Feinberg J. (1968) 'Collective responsibility' *Journal of Philosophy* Vol. 65 No. 21 pp. 674-688. Also in his (1970) *Doing and Deserving* Princeton NJ: University Press.

Hedahl M. (2013) 'The collective fallacy: the possibility of irreducibly collective action without corresponding collective moral responsibility' *Philosophy of Social Sciences* 43(3) 283-300.

Held V. (1970) 'Can a random collection of individuals be morally responsible?' *Journal of Philosophy* Vol. 67 No. 14 pp. 471-481.

Isaacs T. 2011. *Moral Responsibility in Collective Contexts*. Oxford: OUP.

Lawford-Smith, H. (2012) 'The Feasibility of Collectives' Actions' *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* 90 (3):453-467.

Parfit D. (2011) *On What Matters* Oxford: OUP Vol. 1 ch.13 sec. 43 'Each-we dilemmas'.  
If you search for this on the Library catalogue, you'll find an e-book version viewable online.

Parfit D. 'What we together do' (1988). Never published but available in draft form at:  
[http://individual.utoronto.ca/stafforini/parfit/parfit\\_-\\_what\\_we\\_together\\_do.pdf](http://individual.utoronto.ca/stafforini/parfit/parfit_-_what_we_together_do.pdf)

Parfit D. (1984) *Reasons and Persons* Oxford: OUP. Ch. 3. See also ch. 4.

Petersson B. (2008) 'Collective Omissions and Responsibility' *Philosophical Papers* 37 (2).

Petersson B. (2004) 'The second mistake in moral mathematics is not about the worth of mere participation' *Utilitas* Vol. 16 pp. 288-315

Pettit P. (2007) 'Responsibility Incorporated' *Ethics* Vol. 117 No. 2 pp. 117-201.

Schwenkenbecher A. (2014, forthcoming) 'Joint Moral Duties' *Midwest Studies in Philosophy* 38.  
Available in draft form at: <http://philpapers.org/archive/SCHJMD-2.pdf>

Tannssjo T. (1989) 'The Morality of Collective Actions' *Philosophical Quarterly* Vol. 39, No. 155  
pp. 221-228.

Tollefsen D. P. (2003) 'Participant reactive attitudes and collective responsibility' *Philosophical Explorations* 6:3 218-234.

Wringe B. (2014) 'Collective obligations: their existence, their explanatory power, and their supervenience on the obligations of individuals'. *European Journal of Philosophy* Vol. 21.

Wringe B. (2010) 'Global obligations and the agency objection' *Ratio* 23 (2): 217-231.

Zimmerman M. J. (1985) 'Sharing Responsibility' *American Philosophical Quarterly* 22:2.

## WEEK 10: COMPLICITY

### Tutorial text (mandatory):

Williams, Garrath., "The Social Creation of Morality and Complicity in Collective Harms: A Kantian Account", *The Journal of Applied Philosophy* (2018).

### Further readings:

Allais, Lucy., "What properly belongs to me: Kant on giving to beggars," *Journal of Moral Philosophy* 12 (2015): 754–71.

Cholbi, Michael., "The Murderer at the Door: What Kant Should Have Said," in *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 79 (1) (2009): 17-49.

Driver, Julia. "Kantian Complicity" in Mark Timmons and Robert N. Johnson (eds.) *Reason, Value, and Respect: Kantian Themes from the Philosophy of Thomas E. Hill, Jr.* (OUP, 2015)

Hill, Thomas, "Moral Responsibilities of Bystanders," *Journal of Social Philosophy*, 41 (2010), 28–39.

Kant, Immanuel., "On a supposed right to lie from philanthropy" (1797), in M. Gregor (trans./ed.), *Kant: Practical Philosophy* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996).

Kagan, Shelly., 'Do I make a difference?' *Philosophy & Public Affairs* 39 (2011): 105–41.

Korsgaard, Christine., "The Right to Lie: Kant on Dealing with Evil" in *Creating the Kingdom of Ends* (CUP, 1996).

---- “Taking the Law into Our Own Hands: Kant on the Right to Revolution” in *The Constitution of Agency*, 2008.

-----“The claims of animals and the needs of strangers: two cases of imperfect right,” *Journal of Practical Ethics* 6 (2018): 19–51.

Kutz, Christopher, *Complicity: Ethics and Law for a Collective Age* (Cambridge:Cambridge University Press, 2000).

Schapiro, Tamar, ‘Compliance, complicity, and the nature of nonideal conditions’, *Journal of Philosophy* 100 (2003): 329–55.

----- ‘Kantian rigorism and mitigating circumstances’, *Ethics* 117 (2006): 32–57.

## WEEK 11: TORTURE

### **Tutorial text (mandatory):**

Mayerfield, Jamie. “In Defence of the Absolute Prohibition on Torture,” *Public Affairs Quarterly*, 22(2) (2008): 109–28.

### **Further readings:**

Anscombe, G.E.M. “Mr Truman’s Degree.” Pamphlet published by the author, Oxford, 1958. Available at <http://www.ifac.univ-nantes.fr/IMG/pdf/Anscombe-truman.pdf>

Brecher, Bob. *Torture and the Ticking Bomb* (Oxford: Blackwell: 2008) (available as online book in the library).

Hill, Daniel. “Ticking Bombs, Torture and the Analogy with Self-defence,” *American Philosophical Quarterly*, 44 (2007): 395–404.

Juratowitch, Ben. “Torture is Always Wrong,” *Public Affairs Quarterly*, 22(2): 81–90.

Matthews, Richard. *The Absolute Violation: Why Torture Must be Prohibited* (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2008).

Mayerfield, Jamie. “In Defence of the Absolute Prohibition on Torture,” *Public Affairs Quarterly*, 22(2) (2008): 109–28.

Miller, Seumas. “Torture”, *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Summer 2017 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2017/entries/torture/>>.  
Shue, Henry. “Torture,” *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 7 (1978): 124–43.

Steinhoff, Uwe. “Torture: The Case for Dirty Harry and Against Alan Dershowitz,” *Journal of Applied Philosophy*, 23(3) (2006): 337–353.

— “Defusing the Ticking Social Bomb Argument: The Right to Self-defensive Torture,” *Global Dialogue*, 12 (1) (2010) (Winter/Spring 2010).

Sussman, David. “What’s Wrong with Torture?,” *Philosophy and Public Affairs*, 33 (2005): 1–33.

Thaler, Mathias. “A Pragmatist Defence of the Ban on Torture: From Moral Absolutes to Constitutive Rules of Reasoning,” *Political Studies* 64(3) (2016): 765-781.

## 7. Exam Sample\*

\*The exam sample is for guidance only. The Syllabus might have been slightly different in past years. Detailed advice on exam preparation will be provided on the Exam Revision Lecture.

ETHICS 2<sup>nd</sup> year paper.

2 hours

Candidates must answer 2 questions from the following.

1. 'There is no useful sense in which we could claim it to be wrong to act on maxims that could not even *be* universal laws' (Parfit). Is Parfit right?
2. Does someone act wrongly when and only when they act on a maxim that they could not rationally will to be a universal law?
3. Can we act impermissibly even though each of us acts permissibly?
4. Is it possible for a person of good character to act badly more often than not?
5. Is blaming others justified only if determinism is false?
6. How does saying 'I promise' differ from saying 'I will'?

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES  
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

**PHILOSOPHY**

**COURSE UNIT OUTLINE 2018-19**

|   |
|---|
| <b>PHIL20261 Philosophy of Science</b><br><b>Semester: 1    Credits: 20</b> |
|---|

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

- Lecturer:** Professor Chris Daly  
**Office:** 2.55, Humanities Bridgeford Street  
**Telephone:** 0161 275 4892  
**Email:** Christopher.Daly@manchester.ac.uk  
**Office Hours:** Please email to arrange an appointment outside of these hours.
- Tutors:** Tutorials will be taken by Jonathan Bebb
- Administrator:** Chris Ashworth, UG Office, G.001 Arthur Lewis Building  
Tel: 0161 275 7129, Email: Christopher.Ashworth@manchester.ac.uk
- Lectures:** Mondays 12-2
- Tutorials:** Thursdays  
Allocate yourself to a tutorial group using the Student System  
(this is compulsory and on a first come, first served basis)
- Assessment:** 2 hour exam                  67%  
2,000 word essay              33%
- Reading Week:** Monday 29<sup>th</sup> 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\*\*\***

|   |
|---|
| <b>Pre-requisite(s):</b> 20 PHIL credits at Level 1 |
|---|

**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

This course introduces several major controversies in the philosophy of science and uses them to investigate the nature of science, its methods, and its accomplishments.

### Aims

The course aims to:

- Introduce students to key issues in the philosophy of science.
- Enhance their skills at understanding and evaluating philosophical problems.
- Acquaint students with some of the special concepts used in characterising scientific methodology.

### Learning Outcomes

By the end of the course, students should have:

- Knowledge of some central problems in the philosophy of science and of certain possible solutions to them.
- The ability to assess some received wisdom about the nature and purpose of science and of scientific method.
- An understanding of key philosophical concepts such as inductive reasoning, empirical refutation, confirmation, law of nature, and explanation.

## 3. COURSE ORGANISATION

**Lectures:** Monday 12-2pm in Roscoe Building, Room 3.2

**Tutorials:**

| DAY & TIME   | LOCATION                | Tutor  |
|--------------|-------------------------|--------|
| Thursday 1-2 | Crawford House_SEM RM B | J.Bebb |
| Thursday 2-3 | Crawford House_SEM RM B | J.Bebb |
| Thursday 3-4 | Crawford House_SEM RM B | J.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.

### 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:**

There is no recommended textbook for this course.

**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, <http://www.socialsciences.manchester.ac.uk/student-intranet/undergraduate/course-information/philosophy/>

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/useful-documents/>) 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 2,000 words (titles listed below) that 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. The marker is not obliged to read any more than the number of words specified above and may ignore any additional material if they choose.

## 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.** 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*, available from the Philosophy intranet site. **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

PHIL20261 Philosophy of Mind 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 20<sup>th</sup> November**. 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. The penalties for late submission of essays are as follows: 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 (Lewis, 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 PHIL20261. 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**

Choose any one of the following three essay titles:

(Q1) Is it rational to use induction?

(Q2) Has Popper successfully shown how science can progress without using induction?

(Q3) What does Kuhn mean by paradigm change? Can such a change be rational?

## 5. COURSE OUTLINE

| Week | Topic                        |
|------|------------------------------|
| 1    | The problem of induction     |
| 2    | Popper                       |
| 3    | Kuhn                         |
| 4    | Explanation 1                |
| 5    | Explanation 2                |
| 6    | READING WEEK                 |
| 7    | Confirmation theory          |
| 8    | Prediction and accommodation |
| 9    | Laws of nature 1             |
| 10   | Laws of nature 2             |
| 11   | Scientific realism           |
| 12   | Revision                     |

**Preparation for Week 2 tutorials:** See the document on the Blackboard site, under 'Week 1' in Course Content.

**A note on the lectures:** Normally, roughly the first hour will be a straightforward lecture, with the second hour a guided discussion session aimed at consolidating understanding of the material we covered earlier in the day.

## 6. READING LIST

There are lots of textbooks that cover some of the material in this course. These might help you if you are finding a particular topic difficult (and are also a good source of references to additional texts). For example:

- Lisa Bortolotti, *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Science*, Cambridge; Polity, 2008. (There are lots of copies of this in the main library and High Demand.)
- James Ladyman, *Understanding Philosophy of Science*, London: Routledge, 2002. (Available through the library as a Dawson e-book, either to read online or to download for up to 5 days.)

Many of the articles/book chapters (or extracts from them) – plus others that will be relevant – are also to be found in:

- J. A. Cover & M. Curd, *Philosophy of Science: The Central Issues* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1998).

KEY FOR READING BELOW:

\* recommended reading

\*\* essential reading

### [1] The problem of induction

Hume's classic statements of the problem:

\*\* David Hume *An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding* □□IV, V part I.

Online at: <http://ebooks.adelaide.edu.au/h/hume/david/h92e/chapter4.html>

\*\* David Hume *A Treatise of Human Nature* book I, part III, □□VI-VII

Online at: <http://ebooks.adelaide.edu.au/h/hume/david/h92t/B1.3.6.html>

Good introductory presentations of the problem:

\* Bertrand Russell *Problems of Philosophy* ch.6. Reprinted in Richard Swinburne (ed.) *The Justification of Induction*. Online at: <http://www.ditext.com/russell/rus6.html>

\* Brian Skyrms *Choice and Chance* ch.1.

\* James Ladyman *Understanding Philosophy of Science* chs.1 & 2.  
Lisa Bortolotti *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Science* chapter 2 sections 2.2 and 2.3.  
Wesley C. Salmon 'An Encounter with David Hume' in Joel Feinberg (ed.) *Reason and Responsibility*.

For discussion of Hume:

Helen Beebe 2006. *Hume on Causation* (Abingdon: Routledge), Ch.3  
Helen Beebe 2011. 'Necessary connections and the problem of induction', *Nous*, 45 (2011): 504-27. [onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1468-0068.2010.00821.x/abstract](http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1111/j.1468-0068.2010.00821.x/abstract)  
Barry Stroud *Hume* ch.3.  
Okasha, S. 2001. 'What did Hume really show about induction?' *The Philosophical Quarterly*, 51: 307-27.  
Anthony Flew *Hume's Philosophy of Belief* ch.4.  
Jonathan Bennett Locke, Berkeley, Hume ch.11

For 1950s attempts to show the problem of induction is only a linguistic muddle:

Max Black *Problems of Analysis* chs. 10 & 11.  
Max Black *Language and Philosophy* ch. 3.  
Paul Edwards 'Bertrand Russell's Doubts About Induction' in A.G.N. Flew (ed.) *Logic and Language series I*. Reprinted in Richard Swinburne (ed.) *The Justification of Induction*.  
P.F. Strawson *Introduction to Logical Theory* ch.9, part II. Reprinted in: H. Feigl, W. Sellars, and K. Lehrer (eds.) *New Readings in Philosophical Analysis*.  
A. J. Ayer *The Problem of Knowledge* ch.2.  
Nelson Goodman *Fact, Fiction, and Forecast* ch.3 §§1-2.

For replies to such attempts:

J.O. Urmson 'Some Questions Concerning Validity' in A.G.N. Flew (ed.) *Essays in Conceptual Analysis*. Reprinted in Richard Swinburne (ed.) *The Justification of Induction*.  
Brian Skyrms *Choice and Chance* ch.2.  
Simon Blackburn *Reason and Prediction* chs.1 and 2.

## [2] Karl Popper

\* Karl Popper *Conjectures and Refutations* chs.1 and 10 (skip the appendix). Chapter 1 is reprinted in Martin Curd & J.A. Cover (eds.) *The Philosophy of Science*, and also in C.A. Mace (ed.) *British Philosophy in Mid-Century*.  
\* Karl Popper *Objective Knowledge* chs.1 and 2, appendix 12.  
\* Karl Popper *The Logic of Scientific Discovery*. (Popper's book-length presentation of his views). See especially chs. 1, 2, 4, 5, 10.

Introductory presentations:

\* James Ladyman *Understanding Philosophy of Science* ch.3.  
\* Stephen Thornton's *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* article on Popper (see sections 3-5) is online at: <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/popper/#ProDem>  
\* Sven Ove Hansson's *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* article on pseudo-science has a section on falsification. Visit: <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/pseudo-science/#KarPop>  
W.H. Newton-Smith *The Rationality of Science* ch.3.  
David Papineau 'Methodology' in A.C. Grayling (ed.) *Philosophy: A Guide Through the Subject*.

Critical discussion of Popper:

- \* Hilary Putnam 'The 'Corroboration' of Theories' in P.A. Schilpp (ed.) *The Philosophy of Karl Popper*. Reprinted in *Putnam's Mathematics, Matter, and Method: Philosophical Papers vol. 1*, and in Anthony O'Hear and Myles Burnyeat (eds.) *What Philosophy Is*.
- W.C. Salmon 'Rational Prediction' *British Journal of the Philosophy of Science* 32 (1981) pp.115-125. Reprinted in Martin Curd & J.A. Cover (eds.) *The Philosophy of Science*.
- Richard Swinburne 'Falsifiability of Scientific Theories' *Mind* 73 (1964).
- W. Kneale 'Scientific Revolutions for ever?' *British Journal of the Philosophy of Science* 19 (1968).

### [3] Thomas Kuhn

- \* Thomas Kuhn *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions* (including appendix to 2nd edition).
- Thomas Kuhn *The Essential Tension* chs.9-13.
- Thomas Kuhn 1990. 'The road since *Structure*, *Proceedings of the Biennial Meeting of the Philosophy of Science Association*, 1990: 3-13.

### Commentaries:

- \* James Ladyman *Understanding Philosophy of Science* ch.4.
- \* Lisa Bortolotti *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Science* chapter 5.
- \* Alexander Bird *Thomas Kuhn*. (A book length introductory treatment).
- Ian Hacking 1981. (ed.) *Scientific Revolutions*
- W.H. Newton-Smith *The Rationality of Science* chs. 5 & 7.
- P. Hoyningen-Huene *Reconstructing Scientific Revolutions: Thomas Kuhn's Philosophy of Science*.

### [4] Explanation

#### The Deductive-Nomological Account (the D-N account)

- Carl Hempel *Philosophy of Natural Science* ch.5.
- James Woodward's *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* article on the D-N model is online at: <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/scientific-explanation/#2>
- James Ladyman *Understanding Philosophy of Science* ch.7 §§7.1 and 7.2.
- \* Carl Hempel 'Aspects of Scientific Explanation' in *Hempel's Aspects of Scientific Explanation* pp.333-354, 364-376, 428-442.
- \* Carl Hempel (with Paul Oppenheim) 'Studies in the Logic of Explanation' in *Hempel's Aspects of Scientific Explanation*.
- Karl Popper 'The Aim of Science' in his *Objective Knowledge*.
- Ernest Nagel *The Structure of Science* chs. 2 and 3.

#### Objections to the D-N account

- Michael Scriven 'Explanation, Prediction and Laws' in Herbert Feigl and Grover Maxwell (eds.) *Minnesota Studies in the Philosophy of Science*.
- \* Lisa Bortolotti *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Science* chapter 3 section 3.3.
- S. Bromberger 'Why Questions' in Baruch Brody (ed.) *Readings in the Philosophy of Science*.
- Wesley C. Salmon *Causality and Explanation* chs.6 and 9.

#### Explanation as Unification

- \* James Woodward's *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* article on explanation is online at: <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/scientific-explanation/#5>
- \* Michael Friedman 'Explanation and Scientific Understanding' *Journal of Philosophy* 71 1974. Reprinted in Richard Boyd, Philip Gasper and J.D. Trout (eds.) *The Philosophy of Science*.
- Philip Kitcher 'Explanation, Conjunction and Unification' *Journal of Philosophy* 73 (1976).
- Philip Kitcher 'Explanatory Unification' *Philosophy of Science* 48 (1981).
- Wesley C. Salmon *Causality and Explanation* ch.4.

## Causal Explanation

- \* James Woodward's *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* article is online at: <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/scientific-explanation/#4>
- \* David Lewis 'Causal Explanation' in his *Philosophical Papers volume 2*.
- Wesley C. Salmon *Causality and Explanation* chs.7 & 8.

## Pragmatics and Explanation

- \* Bas van Fraassen *The Scientific Image* ch.5.
- \* Bas van Fraassen 'The Pragmatics of Explanation' *American Philosophical Quarterly* 14 (1977). Also in R. Boyd, P. Gasper and J. Trout (eds.) *The Philosophy of Science*, and in Baruch Brody (ed.) *Readings in the Philosophy of Science*.
- \* Alan Garfinkel *Forms of Explanation* ch.1.
- Wesley C. Salmon *Causality and Explanation* ch.11.

## [5] Confirmation Theory

Good introductory reading would be:

- \* Carl G. Hempel *Philosophy of Natural Science* chs. 1-4.
- \* Lisa Bortolotti *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Science* chapter 3 section 3.2.

## Goodman's grue paradox

- \*\* Nelson Goodman *Fact, Fiction, and Forecast* ch.3. Reprinted in Peter Achinstein (ed.) *The Concept of Evidence*, and in Baruch Brody (ed.) *Readings in the Philosophy of Science*.

For discussion of Goodman's paradox:

- John Vickers' *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* article on the problem of induction, section 3.2 is online at: <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/induction-problem/#IndJus>
- B. Skyrms *Choice and Chance* ch.3. (A clear introductory presentation).
- R. Swinburne 1971. 'The paradoxes of confirmation: a survey', *American Philosophical Quarterly*, 8: 318-30.

## Hempel's raven paradox

- \* Carl G. Hempel 'Studies in the Logic of Confirmation (I) and (II)' *Mind* 54 (1945) pp.1-26 and pp.97-121. Online at JSTOR: <http://www.jstor.org/>. See especially sections §§3-5. Reprinted in Hempel's *Aspects of Scientific Explanation*, in Baruch Brody (ed.) *Readings in the Philosophy of Science*, and in Peter Achinstein (ed.) *The Concept of Evidence*.

For discussion of Hempel's paradox:

- A.J. Ayer *Probability and Evidence* ch.1 section D.
- Peter Lipton 2007. 'The ravens revisited', *Royal Institute of Philosophy Supplement*, 61: 75-95.
- B.A. Brody 'Confirmation and Explanation' in Baruch Brody (ed.) *Readings in the Philosophy of Science*.

## [6] Prediction and Accommodation

- Peter Lipton 'Testing Hypotheses: Prediction and Prejudice' *Science* 307 (5707) Jan 2005 pp.219-221. Online at <http://www.sciencemag.org/cgi/content/full/307/5707/219>
- G. Schlesinger 'Accommodation and Prediction' *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* 65 (1987) pp.33-42.
- Robin Collins 'Against the Epistemic Value of Prediction over Accommodation' *Noûs* 28 (1994) pp. 210-224.

M. Gardner 'Predicting Novel Facts' *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 33 (1982) pp.1-15.  
Peter Lipton *Inference to the Best Explanation* ch.10.

## [7] Laws of Nature

\* John Carroll's Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy article on laws of nature is online at:  
<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/laws-of-nature/>

Humean account of laws:

\* Carl Hempel *Philosophy of Natural Science* ch.5, section 3.

\* Carl Hempel *Aspects of Scientific Explanation* pp.264-270.

A.J. Ayer 'What is a Law of Nature?' in his *The Concept of Person and Other Essays*.

Reprinted in:

Baruch Brody (ed.) *Readings in the Philosophy of Science*

Martin Curd & J.A. Cover (eds.) *The Philosophy of Science*.

Nelson Goodman *Fact, Fiction, and Forecast* ch.1 section 3.

David Lewis *Counterfactuals* pp.72-77.

Criticisms of Humean accounts of laws:

D.M. Armstrong *What Is A Law of Nature?* part I

John W. Carroll *Laws of Nature* chs.1-2.

Non-Humean accounts of laws:

D.M. Armstrong *What Is A Law of Nature?* part II.

\* Fred I. Dretske 'Laws of Nature' *Philosophy of Science* 44 (1977) pp.248-268. Reprinted  
in Martin Curd & Cover (eds.) *The Philosophy of Science*.

Michael Tooley *Causation* pp.67-91, 106-141.

Criticisms of non-Humean account of laws:

Helen Beebe 2000. 'The non-governing conception of laws of nature', *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 56: 571-94.

D.H. Mellor 'Necessities and Universals in Natural Laws' in his *Matters of Metaphysics*.

Reprinted in Martin Curd & J.A. Cover (eds.) *The Philosophy of Science*.

Bas van Fraassen *Laws and Symmetry* ch.5.

J. Earman 'Laws of Nature: The Empiricist Challenge' in R. Bogdan (ed.) *D.M. Armstrong*.

David Lewis 'New Work for A Theory of Universals' in his *Papers in Metaphysics and Epistemology* just pp.39-43.

John Carroll *Laws of Nature* pp.161-181.

## [8] Scientific Realism and Its Rivals

Scientific Realism:

\* James Ladyman *Understanding Philosophy of Science* chs.5-8.

\* Richard Boyd's Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy article on scientific realism is online at: <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/scientific-realism/> See §§1-3 only.

\* Lisa Bortolotti *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Science* chapter 4 sections 4.3 and 4.4.

W.H. Newton-Smith *The Rationality of Science* ch.2.

Hilary Putnam *Meaning and the Moral Sciences* pp.18-22

Nancy Cartwright 1983. *How the Laws of Physics Lie* chs.4 & 5

Grover Maxwell 1962. 'The ontological status of theoretical entities', *Minnesota Studies in Philosophy of Science III*. [www.mcps.umn.edu/assets/pdf/3.1\\_Maxwell.pdf](http://www.mcps.umn.edu/assets/pdf/3.1_Maxwell.pdf)

The Pessimistic Induction

James Ladyman *Understanding Philosophy of Science* pp.230-231, 236-243.  
Larry Laudan 'A Confutation of Convergent Realism' *Philosophy of Science* 48 (1981)  
pp.19-49. Reprinted in Martin Curd & J.A. Cover (eds.) *The Philosophy of Science*.  
C. Hardin and A. Rosenberg 'In Defence of Convergent Realism' *Philosophy of Science*  
49 (1982) pp.604-615.

Bas van Fraassen's constructive empiricism

\* Bas van Fraassen *The Scientific Image* chs.1-3.

Paul Churchland and C.A. Hooker (eds.) *Images of Science: Essays on Realism and Empiricism*. (A collection of papers on constructive empiricism, with van Fraassen's replies). See especially papers 2 & 9.

Stathis Psillos *Scientific Realism: How Science Tracks the Truth* ch.9.

## **8. SAMPLE EXAM PAPER (for guidance only)**

The exam paper will have the following format:

Answer any two of the following six questions:

- (1) Is the problem of induction merely the result of a linguistic muddle?
- (2) Does Popper successfully show that science can be both rational and dispense with induction?
- (3) How might the Deductive-Nomological model of explanation meet the problems which face it?
- (4) Is anything grue?
- (5) Does finding a pink shoe confirm the hypothesis that all ravens are black? If so, why? If not, why not?
- (6) Do laws of nature involve some kind of necessity? If so, why? If not, why not?

FACULTY OF HUMANITIES  
SCHOOL OF SOCIAL SCIENCES  
**PHILOSOPHY**  
**COURSE UNIT OUTLINE 2018-19**

|  |
|--|
| <b>PHIL20272 – PHILOSOPHY OF MIND</b><br><b>Semester: 2    Credits: 20</b> |
|--|

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

|                             |   |
|-----------------------------|---|
| <b>Lecturer(s):</b>         | Dr. Stephen Ingram  |
| <b>Office:</b>              | HBS 2.55  |
| <b>Telephone:</b>           | TBC   |
| <b>Email:</b>               | <a href="mailto:stephen.ingram@manchester.ac.uk">stephen.ingram@manchester.ac.uk</a>  |
| <b>Office Hours:</b>        | Mondays 13.00-14.00 and Thursdays 10.00-11.00<br>Please email to arrange an appointment outside of these hours.   |
| <b>Tutors:</b>              | Emile Chan and Benedetta Magro  |
| <b>Administrator:</b>       | Christopher Ashworth, UG Office, G.001 Arthur Lewis Building<br>Tel: 0161 275 7129, Email: <a href="mailto:christopher.ashworth@manchester.ac.uk">christopher.ashworth@manchester.ac.uk</a>         |
| <b>Lectures:</b>            | Monday 11.00-13.00, Roscoe 1.009  |
| <b>Tutorials:</b>           | The tutorial time slots are on page 4 of this document.<br>Allocate yourself to a tutorial group using the Student System<br>(this is compulsory and on a first come, first served basis)           |
| <b>Assessment:</b>          | 2000 word essay (33%) and 2-hour unseen exam (67%)  |
| <b>Easter Break:</b>        | Monday 8 <sup>th</sup> April 2019 – Friday 26 <sup>th</sup> April 2019  |
| <b>Philosophy Intranet:</b> | <a href="#">Click here for the philosophy intranet</a><br>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\*\*\***

|                               |
|-------------------------------|
| <b>Pre-requisite(s):</b> None |
|-------------------------------|

|  |
|--|
| <b>Communication:</b> <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

# 1. ABOUT THE COURSE

## Summary

How is the mind related to body? What is consciousness, and can it be captured within a scientific picture of the universe? What, if anything, makes you the same person as you were last night, or last week, or last year? In this course we will investigate such questions, giving you the opportunity to creatively engage in debates about the nature of the mind and its place in the world.

## Aims

This course aims to...

- ... clarify central terms and concepts in the philosophy of mind;
- ... deepen your knowledge of key debates in the philosophy of mind;
- ... explore links between different areas of the philosophy of mind;
- ... address the role of empirical, scientific data in the philosophy of mind.

## Learning Outcomes

By the end of this course, you will have...

- ... explored the nature of mental life;
- ... evaluated rival attempts to solve to the mind-body problem;
- ... engaged creatively with ongoing debates in the philosophy of mind;
- ... improved your skills in reading, writing, and discussing philosophical ideas.

## 2. COURSE ORGANISATION

**Lectures:** Monday 11.00-13.00, Roscoe 1.009

**Tutorials:**

| DAY & TIME   | LOCATION                | TEACHING ASSISTANT |
|--------------|-------------------------|--------------------|
| Tues 2-3pm   | Crawford House_SEM RM E | Emile Chan         |
| Friday 1-2pm | Crawford House_SEM RM C | Benedetta Magro    |
| Friday 2-3pm | Crawford House_SEM RM C | Benedetta Magro    |

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 – Experience

Week 02 – Intentionality

Week 03 – Personal Identity

Week 04 – Perception

Week 05 – Anomalous Monism

Week 06 – Functionalism I

Week 07 – Functionalism II

Week 08 – Dualism

Week 09 – Idealism

Week 10 – Panpsychism

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 on 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 at:

<https://online.manchester.ac.uk>

### 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 x 2 = 20 hours       |
| Tutorials            | 10 hours                |
| Tutorial preparation | 10 x 5 hours = 50 hours |
| Essay preparation    | 40 hours                |
| Exam preparation     | 80 hours                |
| <b>TOTAL:</b>        | <b>200 hours</b>        |

### 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.

### 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.

Sample exam questions will be made once all the lectures are complete.

### ASSESSED ESSAYS

One essay of **2000 words** 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

This unit 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 **19/03/19**. 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 PHIL20271. 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.

If you've read to this point in the Course Outline, feel free to send Stephen a picture of a cute dog, cat, 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;
- ... 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;
- ... obtaining feedback from your peers during tutorials.

## Assessed Essay Titles

*These will be posted on Blackboard early in the semester.*

## Exam

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:

- ... Anomalous Monism;
- ... Functionalism I;
- ... Functionalism II;
- ... Dualism;
- ... Idealism;
- ... Panpsychism.

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 2015-16**

|   |
|---|
| <p><b>PHIL20612 Phenomenology</b><br/><b>Semester: 2    Credits: 20</b></p> |
|---|

**This course guide should be read in conjunction with the *Philosophy Study Guide 2015-16*, available from the Philosophy Intranet.**

**Lecturer(s):** Dr Joel Smith  
**Office:** Humanities Bridgeford 2.43  
**Telephone:** 0161 275 1760  
**Email:** [joel.smith@manchester.ac.uk](mailto:joel.smith@manchester.ac.uk)  
**Office Hours:** Wednesday 10.00 - 12.00

Please email to arrange an appointment outside of these hours.

**Tutors:** Tutorials will be taken by a Teaching Assistant – see below.  
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](mailto:christopher.ashworth@manchester.ac.uk)

**Lectures:** Friday 10.00-12.00, Roscoe 3.2

**Tutorials:** Friday: 1-2pm, 2-3pm, 3-4pm  
Monday: 2-3pm, 3-4pm  
Allocate yourself to a tutorial group using the Student System  
(this is compulsory and on a first come, first served basis)

**Assessment:** 2 hour exam                      67%  
2,000 word essay                      33% **\*\*2pm, Tuesday, 14th March, 2018\*\***

**Easter Vacation:** Monday 26 March 2018 - Friday 13 April 2018

**Philosophy Intranet:** <http://www.socialsciences.manchester.ac.uk/student-intranet/undergraduate/>

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\*\*\***

|                          |                            |
|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| <b>Pre-requisite(s):</b> | 20 PHIL credits at Level 1 |
|--------------------------|----------------------------|

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

**Examination period:** Monday 14th May – Friday 8th June 2018

**Resit Examination period:** Monday 20th August – Friday 31st August 2018

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**

Phenomenology is the study of the structure of experience. In this course unit we will examine aspects of the work of some of the most important Twentieth Century phenomenologists: Edmund Husserl, Martin Heidegger, Edith Stein, Jean-Paul Sartre and Maurice Merleau-Ponty. Topics covered include: the nature of intentionality, perception and imagination; our awareness of self, body and others; and our consciousness of time. We shall also look at what is distinctive about the methods of phenomenological philosophy.

### **Aims**

The course aims to:

- introduce students to the philosophical writings of the Twentieth Century phenomenologists
- present the historical and philosophical context in which phenomenology was developed
- explore in detail some central concepts of phenomenology: intentionality, reduction, constitution, transcendental ego, time-consciousness, embodiment, intersubjectivity, etc
- show how phenomenology relates to issues in metaphysics, epistemology and the philosophy of mind

### **Learning Outcomes**

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

- an ability to identify the main philosophical questions arising in phenomenological texts
- an ability to engage with some of the major issues in the interpretation of the phenomenological tradition in philosophy
- an ability to evaluate the significance of phenomenological philosophy
- an ability to relate the work of Husserl, Heidegger, Stein, Sartre and Merleau-Ponty to other philosophical disciplines

### 3. COURSE ORGANISATION

**Lectures:** Friday 10.00-12.00 in Roscoe 3.2

Lectures are weekly, starting in Week 1.

**Tutorials:**

| DAY & TIME   | LOCATION              | TEACHING ASSISTANT |
|--------------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| Monday 1-2pm | Mansfield Cooper 2.14 | Robert Booth       |
| Monday 2-3pm | Mansfield Cooper 2.04 |                    |
| Friday 1-2pm | Alan Turing G.114     | Abigail Connor     |
| Friday 2-3pm | Zochonis B.22         |                    |
| Friday 3-4pm | Mansfield Cooper 2.14 |                    |

Tutorials are weekly. **Friday's tutorials start in Week 1. Monday's tutorials start 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, Pamela Johnson – Caroline Harmer from mid-April - as soon as possible – 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. However, students may find it useful to buy these overviews/collections:

- Moran, Dermot. & Tim Mooney, eds. 2002. *The Phenomenology Reader*. London: Routledge.
- Smith, Joel. 2016. *Experiencing Phenomenology*. London: Routledge.

**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                |
| <b>TOTAL:</b>        | <b>200 hours</b>        |

### 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 two, 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 here: <http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/pastexams.aspx>

## ASSESSED ESSAYS

One essay of 2,000 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 a 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

PHIL20612 Phenomenology 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 13<sup>th</sup> March 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.

Penalties for late submission are as follows: 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 (Lewis, 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 PHIL20612. 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 (Joel Smith) 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. Critically assess what you take to be the most serious objection to the phenomenological reduction.
2. Critically assess what you take to be the most serious objection to the eidetic reduction.

3. Is intentionality the 'mark of the mental'?
4. Does it make sense to say that some intentional states are about things that do not exist?

## 5. COURSE OUTLINE

### Δ Essay Topics

### Φ Exam Topics

Week 1: The Science of Experience Δ

Week 2: The Objects of Experience Δ

Week 3: Experiencing Things Φ

Week 4: Experiencing Properties Φ

Week 5: Experiencing Events Φ

Week 6: Experiencing Possibilities Φ

Week 7: Experiencing Oneself Φ

Week 8: Experiencing Embodiment Φ

### EASTER BREAK

Week 9: Experiencing Others Φ

Week 10: Experiencing Value Φ

## 6. READING LIST

### ***General Reading List***

*The following are relevant to a number of topics covered.*

- Bernet, Rudolf, Iso Kern & Eduard Marbach. 1993. *An Introduction to Husserlian Phenomenology*. Evanston, IL: Northwestern.  
[A difficult but detailed introduction to Husserl]
- Carman, Taylor. 2008. *Merleau-Ponty*. London: Routledge.  
[An excellent introduction to a broad range of themes in Merleau-Ponty's work]
- Carman, Taylor & Mark Hansen, eds. 2005. *Cambridge Companion to Merleau-Ponty*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.  
[For the most part, an excellent collection of essays]
- Cerbone, David. 2006. *Understanding Phenomenology*. Chesham: Acumen.  
[This is, perhaps, the best place to start. It introduces phenomenology in a very accessible manner]
- Dreyfus, Hubert & Mark Wrathall, eds. 2006. *A Companion to Phenomenology and Existentialism*. Oxford: Blackwell.  
[Lots of helpful introductory essays on a broad range of phenomenological topics]

- Gallagher, Shaun. & Dan Zahavi. 2012. *The Phenomenological Mind*, 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition. London: Routledge.

[This advanced introduction is good at situating phenomenological issues within the context of contemporary philosophy of mind and psychology]

- Hammond, Michael, Jane Howarth, Russell Keat. 1991. *Understanding Phenomenology*. Oxford: Blackwell.

[A clear introduction to many of the themes of this course]

- Lewis, Michael & Tanja Staehler. 2010. *Phenomenology: An Introduction*. London: Continuum.

[Some useful introductory material]

- Luft, Sebastian & Søren Overgaard, eds. 2012. *The Routledge Companion to Phenomenology*. London: Routledge.

[A very useful collection of high-level introductory essays]

- McCulloch, Gregory. 1994. *Using Sartre*. London: Routledge.

[An excellent book, relating Sartre to contemporary philosophy of mind]

- Moran, Dermot. 2000. *Introduction to Phenomenology*. London: Routledge.

[A comprehensive introduction to phenomenology, particularly useful on Husserl & Heidegger]

- Moran, Dermot. & Tim Mooney, eds. 2002. *The Phenomenology Reader*. London: Routledge.

[Several of the tutorial readings are reprinted in this handy reader]

- Smith, Barry. & David Woodruff Smith, eds. 1995. *Cambridge Companion to Husserl*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[As usual with the Cambridge Companions, an excellent collection of introductory essays]

- Smith, David Woodruff & Amie Thomasson, eds. 2005. *Phenomenology and Philosophy of Mind*. Oxford: Clarendon.

[Collection of advanced essays relating phenomenological themes to contemporary philosophy of mind and psychology]

- Sokolowski, Robert. 2000. *Introduction to Phenomenology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

[A very useful introduction to Husserlian phenomenology]

- Spiegelberg, Herbert. 1976. *The Phenomenological Movement: A Historical Introduction*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.

[Monumental two volume history of Phenomenology from Brentano onwards]

## **Week 1: The Science of Experience**

### **Required Reading**

- Husserl, Edmund. 1917. Pure Phenomenology, its Method, and its Field of Investigation. In Dermot Moran & Timothy Mooney, eds. *The Phenomenology Reader*. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Smith, Joel. 2016. *Experiencing Phenomenology*. London: Routledge, Ch.1.

### **Further Reading**

- Bell, David. 1990. *Husserl*. London: Routledge, Ch.3.
- Carman, Taylor. 2006. The Principle of Phenomenology. In Charles Guignon, ed. *Cambridge Companion to Heidegger*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Casey, Edward. 1977. Imagination and Phenomenological Method. In Frederick Elliston & Peter McCormick, eds. *Husserl: Expositions and Appraisals*. Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Crowell, Steven. 2004. Heidegger and Husserl: The Matter and Method of Philosophy. In Hubert Dreyfus & Mark Wrathall, eds. *Blackwell Companion to Heidegger*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Haaparanta, Leila. 2009. The Method of Analysis and the Idea of Pure Philosophy in Husserl's Transcendental Phenomenology. In Michael Beaney, ed. *The Analytic Turn: Analysis in Early Analytic Philosophy and Phenomenology*. London: Routledge.
- Husserl, Edmund. 1902/3. *The Idea of Phenomenology*. Translated by L. Hardy. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1999, Lectures I & II
- Husserl, Edmund. 1913. *Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy, First Book*, translated by F. Kersten. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1998, §§27-33 & §§56-62  
[Also available at <http://www.archive.org>]
- Overgaard, Søren. 2002. Epoche and Solipsistic Reduction. *Husserl Studies* 18
- Soffer, Gail. 2003. Revisiting the Myth: Husserl and Sellars on the Given. *Review of Metaphysics* 57.
- Thomasson, Amie. 2007. Conceptual Analysis in Phenomenology and Ordinary Language Philosophy. In Michael Beaney, ed. *The Analytic Turn: Analysis in Early Analytic Philosophy and Phenomenology*. London: Routledge.  
[Also available at: <http://www.amiethomasson.org/>]

## **Week 2: The Objects of Experience**

### **Required Reading**

- Brentano, Franz. 1874. *Psychology From an Empirical Standpoint*, Book 2, Ch.1: 'The Distinction between Mental and Physical Phenomena'. Edited by Oskar Kraus, Edited by Linda McAlister. London: Routledge, 1995.
- Smith, Joel. 2016. *Experiencing Phenomenology*. London: Routledge, Ch.2.

### **Further Reading**

- Alweiss, Lilian. 2009. Between Internalism and Externalism: Husserl's Account of Intentionality. *Inquiry* 52.
- Bartok, Philip. 2005. Brentano's Intentionality Thesis: Beyond the Analytic and Phenomenological Readings. *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 43
- Crane, Tim. 1998. Intentionality as the mark of the mental. In Anthony O'Hear, ed. *Contemporary Issues in the Philosophy of Mind*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.  
[ Also available at: [www.timcrane.com](http://www.timcrane.com) ]
- Crane, Tim. 2006. Brentano's Concept of Intentional Inexistence. In Mark Textor, ed. *The Austrian Contribution to Philosophy*. London: Routledge.  
[ Also available at [www.timcrane.com](http://www.timcrane.com) ]
- Dreyfus, Hubert. 1993. Heidegger's Critique of the Husserl/Searle Account of Intentionality. *Social Research* 60
- Føllesdal, Dagfinn. 1969. Husserl's Notion of Noema. *Journal of Philosophy* 66
- Husserl, Edmund. 1900/1901. *Logical Investigations*, Vol 2, Investigation V, Ch.2: 'Consciousness as Intentional Experience'. Translated by J.N. Findlay, Edited by Dermot Moran. London: Routledge, 2001.
- Husserl, Edmund. 1913. *Ideas Pertaining to a Pure Phenomenology and to a Phenomenological Philosophy, First Book*, §§87-96: 'Noesis and Noema'. Translated by F. Kersten. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1998.  
[Also available at <http://www.archive.org> ]
- Jacquette, Dale. 2004. Brentano's Concept of Intentionality. In Dale Jacquette, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to Brentano*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McAlister, Linda. 1974. Chisholm and Brentano on Intentionality. *Review of Metaphysics* 28
- Moran, Dermot. 1996. Brentano's Thesis. *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society, Supplementary Volume* 70

### **Week 3: Experiencing Things**

#### **Required Reading**

- Heidegger, Martin. 1925. *History of the Concept of Time*, §5: 'Intentionality'. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985.
- Smith, Joel. 2016. *Experiencing Phenomenology*. London: Routledge, Ch.3.

#### **Further Reading**

- Carman, Taylor. 2003. *Heidegger's Analytic: Interpretation, Discourse and Authenticity in Being and Time*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, Chs.3-4.
- Crane, Tim. 2006. Is there a perceptual relation. In Tamar Gendler & John Hawthorne, eds. *Perceptual Experience*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.  
[ Also available at [www.timcrane.com](http://www.timcrane.com) ]
- Cunningham, Suzanne. 1985. Perceptual Meaning and Husserl. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 45
- Hopp, Walter. 2008. Husserl on Sensation, Perception and Interpretation. *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 38 (2008)
- Kind, Amy (2007). Restrictions on representationalism. *Philosophical Studies* 134
- Macpherson, Fiona. 2006. Ambiguous Figures and the Content of Experience. *Noûs* 40
- Mooney, Tim. 2010. Understanding and Simple Seeing in Husserl. *Husserl Studies* 26 (2010)
- Mulligan, Kevin. 1995. Perception. In David Woodruff Smith & Barry Smith, eds. *Cambridge Companion to Husserl*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Searle, John. 1983. *Intentionality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, Ch.2
- Shim, Michael. 2011. Representationalism and Husserlian Phenomenology. *Husserl Studies* 27

## **Week 4: Experiencing Properties**

### **Required Reading**

- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. 1945. *Phenomenology of Perception*, Part 2, Ch.3, §A: 'Perceptual Constants' (pp.313-331). Translated by Donald Landes. London: Routledge, 2012.  
[ This is available online via the library. Colin Smith's older translation is available at <http://www.archive.org> ]
- Smith, Joel. 2016. *Experiencing Phenomenology*. London: Routledge, Ch.4.

### **Further Reading**

- Kelly, Sean. 1999. What do we see (when we do)? *Philosophical Topics* 27 (1999)  
[ Also available at [www.people.fas.harvard.edu/~sdkelly](http://www.people.fas.harvard.edu/~sdkelly) ]
- Kelly, Sean. 2005. Seeing Things in Merleau-Ponty. In Taylor Carman & Mark Hansen, eds. *The Cambridge Companion to Merleau-Ponty*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Madary, Michael. 2010. Husserl on Perceptual Constancy. *European Journal of Philosophy*.
- Noë, Alva. 2005. Real Presence. *Philosophical Topics* 33 (2005)  
[ Also available at <http://socrates.berkeley.edu/~noe/> ]
- Overgaard, Søren. 2010. On the Looks of Things. *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* 91
- Romdenh-Romluc, Komarine. 2011. *Merleau-Ponty and the Phenomenology of Perception*. London: Routledge, Ch.4
- Schellenberg, Susanna. 2008. The Situation-Dependency of Perception. *Journal of Philosophy* 105
- Schwitzgebel, Eric. 2006. Do Things Look Flat? *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 72
- Siewert, Charles. 2006. Is Shape Appearance Protean? *Psyche* 12 (2006)
- Talero, Maria. 2005. Perception, Normativity, and Selfhood in Merleau-Ponty: The Spatial 'Level' and Existential Space. *Southern Journal of Philosophy* 43

## **Week 5: Experiencing Events**

### **Required Reading**

- Husserl, Edmund. 1905. *On the Phenomenology of the Consciousness of Internal Time (1893-1917)*, §§7-33. Translated by John Barnett Brough. Dordrecht: Kluwer, 1991.  
[This is long, so focus on §§7-17]
- Smith, Joel. 2016. *Experiencing Phenomenology*. London: Routledge, Ch.5.

### **Further Reading**

- Anderson, Holly. 2014. The Development of the 'Specious Present' and James' views on Temporal Experience. In Dan Lloyd & Valtteri Arstila, ed. *Subjective Time*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.  
[ Also available at <http://philpapers.org/profile/5072> ]
- Dainton, Barry. 2000. *Stream of Consciousness*. London: Routledge, Chs.5-7
- Dainton, Barry. 2008. Sensing Change. *Philosophical Issues* 18
- Hoerl, Christoph. 2009. Time and Tense in Perceptual Experience. *Philosophers' Imprint* 9
- James, William. 1890. *The Principles of Psychology*. New York: Holt & Co, Vol.1, Ch.15: 'The Perception of Time'.  
[ Also available at [www.archive.org](http://www.archive.org) ]
- Kelly, Sean. 2005. The Puzzle of Temporal Awareness. In Andrew Brook & Kathleen Akins, eds. *Cognition and Neuroscience*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.  
[ Also available at [www.people.fas.harvard.edu/~sdkelly](http://www.people.fas.harvard.edu/~sdkelly) ]
- Phillips, Ian. 2010. Perceiving Temporal Properties. *European Journal of Philosophy* 18
- Rodemeyer, Lanei. 2006. *Intersubjective Temporality: Its About Time*. Dordrecht: Springer.
- Le Poidevin, Robin. 2007. *The Images of Time: An Essay on Temporal Representation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, Ch.5.
- Zahavi, Dan. 2007. Perception of Duration Presupposes Duration of Perception – or Does it? Husserl and Dainton on Time. *International Journal of Philosophical Studies* 15

## **Week 6: Experiencing Possibilities**

### **Required Reading**

- Sartre, Jean-Paul. 1940. *The Imaginary*, Part I, Ch.1: 'Description' (pp.4-16). Translated by Jonathan Webber. London: Routledge, 2004.
- Smith, Joel. 2016. *Experiencing Phenomenology*. London: Routledge, Ch.6.

### **Further Reading**

- Casey, Edward. 2000. *Imagining: A Phenomenological Study*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- De Preester, Helena. 2012. The Sensory Component of Imagination: The Motor Theory of Imagination as a Present Day Solution to Sartre's Critique. *Philosophical Psychology* 25.
- Hannay, Alastair. 1971. *Mental Images: A Defence*. London: Unwin, Ch.4
- Hopkins, Robert. 1998. *Picture, Image and Experience*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, Ch.7.
- Jansen, Julia. 2005. On the development of Husserl's transcendental phenomenology of imagination and its use in interdisciplinary research. *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences* 4 (2005)
- Kind, Amy. 2001. Putting the Image back in Imagination. *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences* 62.
- Peacocke, Christopher. 1985. Imagination, Experience and Possibility: A Berkeleian View Defended. In John Foster & Howard Robinson, eds. *Essays on Berkeley: A Tercentenary Celebration*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Ricoeur, Paul. 1981. Sartre and Ryle on Imagination. In Paul Schilpp, ed. *The Philosophy of Jean-Paul Sartre*. La Salle, IL: Open Court.
- Stawarska, Beata. 2005. Defining Imagination: Sartre between Husserl and Janet. *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences* 4 (2005)
- Tye, Michael. 1991. *The Imagery Debate*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, Chs. 1-2

## **Week 7: Experiencing Oneself**

### **Required Reading**

- Sartre, Jean-Paul. 1937. *The Transcendence of the Ego*, Part I: 'The I and the me' (pp.1-21). Translated by Andrew Brown. London: Routledge, 2004.
- Smith, Joel. 2016. *Experiencing Phenomenology*. London: Routledge, Ch.7.

### **Further Reading**

- Gardner, Sebastian. 2009. *Sartre's Being and Nothingness*. London: Continuum, 2009, Ch.2
- Gennaro, Rocco. 2002. Jean-Paul Sartre and the HOT theory of consciousness. *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 32.
- Priest, Stephen. 2000. *The Subject in Question: Sartre's Critique of Husserl in The Transcendence of the Ego*. London: Routledge.
- Richmond, Sarah. 2004. Introduction in Sartre, J-P. *The Transcendence of the Ego*, translated by A. Brown. London, Routledge, 2004.
- Stawarska, Beata. 2002. Memory and Subjectivity: Sartre in Dialogue with Husserl. *Sartre Studies International* 8 (2002)
- Sutton Morris, Phyllis. 1985. Sartre on the Transcendence of the Ego. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 46 (1995)
- Wider, Kathleen. 1997. *The Bodily Nature of Consciousness: Sartre and Contemporary Philosophy of Mind*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, Ch.3
- Williford, Kenneth. 2010. Pre-Reflective Self-Consciousness and the Autobiographical Ego. In Jonathan Webber, ed. *Reading Sartre: On Phenomenology and Existentialism*. London: Routledge.
- Zahavi, Dan. 2000. Self and Consciousness. In Dan Zahavi, ed. *Exploring the Self*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Zahavi, Dan. 2005. *Subjectivity and Selfhood: Investigating the First-Person Perspective*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

## **Week 8: Experiencing Embodiment**

### **Required Reading**

- Stein, Edith. 1917. *On the Problem of Empathy*, Chapter 3, §§1-4 (pp.38-56). Translated by Waltrout Stein. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1970.
- Smith, Joel. 2016. *Experiencing Phenomenology*. London: Routledge, Ch.8.

### **Further Reading**

- Carman, Taylor. 1999. The Body in Husserl and Merleau-Ponty. *Philosophical Topics* 27 (1999)  
[Also available at [http://ist-socrates.berkeley.edu/~hdreyfus/188\\_s05/pdf/Carman\\_Body.pdf](http://ist-socrates.berkeley.edu/~hdreyfus/188_s05/pdf/Carman_Body.pdf) ]
- De Vignemont, Frédérique. 2007. Habeas Corpus: The sense of ownership of one's own body. *Mind and Language* 22
- Gallagher, Shaun. 1986. Lived Body and Environment. *Research in Phenomenology* 16
- Heinämaa, Sara. The Body. In Sebastian Luft, & Søren Overgaard, eds. *The Routledge Companion to Phenomenology*. London: Routledge.
- Martin, Michael. 1995. Bodily Awareness: A Sense of Ownership. In José Luis Bermúdez, Anthony Marcel & Naomi Eilan, eds. *The Body and the Self*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Merleau-Ponty, Maurice. 1945. *Phenomenology of Perception*, translated by Colin Smith. London: Routledge, 1962, Part 1  
[Also available at [www.archive.org](http://www.archive.org) ]
- Heinämaa, Sara. The Body. In Sebastian Luft, & Søren Overgaard, eds. *The Routledge Companion to Phenomenology*. London: Routledge.
- Kelly, Sean. 2002. Merleau-Ponty on the body. *Ratio (New Series)* 15  
[Also available at [www.people.fas.harvard.edu/~sdkelly](http://www.people.fas.harvard.edu/~sdkelly) ]
- Romdenh-Romluc, Komarine. 2011. *Merleau-Ponty and the Phenomenology of Perception*. London: Routledge, Ch.3
- Wider, Kathleen. 1997. *The Bodily Nature of Consciousness*. Cornell: Cornell University Press, Ch.5

## **Week 9: Experiencing Others**

### **Required Reading**

- Stein, Edith. 1917. *On the Problem of Empathy*, Chapter 3, §5 (pp.56-89). Translated by Waltrout Stein. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1970.
- Smith, Joel. 2016. *Experiencing Phenomenology*. London: Routledge, Ch.9.

### **Further Reading**

- Carr, David. 1973. The 'Fifth Meditation' and Husserl's Cartesianism. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 34 (1973)
- Dullstein, Monika. 2013. Direct Perception and Simulation: Stein's Account of Empathy. *Review of Philosophy and Psychology* 4
- Gallagher, Shaun. 2005. Phenomenological Contributions to a Theory of Social Cognition. *Husserl Studies* 21 (2005)  
[ Also available at <http://pegasus.cc.ucf.edu/~gallaghr/gallonline.html> ]
- Husserl, Edmund. 1931. *Cartesian Meditations: An Introduction to Phenomenology*, translated by Dorion Cairns. Dordrecht: Kluwer, §§42-54.
- MacIntyre, Alasdair. 2006. *Edith Stein: A Philosophical Prologue, 1913-1922*. Lanham: Rowman & Littlefield, Ch.9.
- McDaniel, Kris. 2016. Edith Stein: On the Problem of Empathy. In Eric Schliesser (ed.), *Ten Neglected Classics of Philosophy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.  
[Also available at <http://philpapers.org/profile/10464>]
- Meneses, Rita W. & Michael Larkin. 2012. Edith Stein and the Contemporary Psychological Study of Empathy. *Journal of Phenomenological Psychology* 43
- Mooney, Timothy. 2007. On the Critiques of Pairing and Appresentation by Merleau-Ponty and Levinas. In C. Cunningham & P. M. Candler, eds. *Transcendence and Phenomenology*. London: SCM Press.
- Staehler, Tanja. 2008. What is the Question to Which Husserl's Fifth *Cartesian Meditation* is the Answer? *Husserl Studies* 24
- Zahavi, Dan. 2014. Empathy and Other-Directed Intentionality. *Topoi* 33

## **Week 10: Experiencing Value**

### **Required Reading**

- Sartre, Jean-Paul. 1939. *Sketch for a Theory of the Emotions*, Ch.3: 'Outline of a Phenomenological Theory' (pp.56-91). Translated by Philip Mairet. London: Routledge, 1981.
- Smith, Joel. 2016. *Experiencing Phenomenology*. London: Routledge, Ch.10.

### **Further Reading**

- Cabestan, Philippe. 2004. What is it to move oneself emotionally? Emotion and affectivity according to Jean-Paul Sartre. *Phenomenology and the Cognitive Sciences* 3
- Fell, Joseph P. 1965. *Emotion in the Thought of Sartre*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Hatzimoysis, Anthony. 2009. Emotions in Heidegger and Sartre. In Peter Goldie, ed. *The Oxford Handbook of Philosophy of Emotion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Mulligan, Kevin. 2009. Emotions and Values. In Peter Goldie, ed. *The Oxford Handbook of Philosophy of Emotion*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Richmond, Sarah. 2010. Magic in Sartre's Early Philosophy. In Jonathan Webber, ed. *Reading Sartre: On Phenomenology and Existentialism*. London: Routledge.
- Richmond, Sarah. 2014. Inconsistency in Sartre's Analysis of Emotion. *Analysis* 74
- Solomon, Robert C. 2003. Emotions, Thoughts and Feelings: What is a 'Cognitive Theory' of the Emotions and Does it Neglect Affectivity? In Anthony Hatzimoysis, ed. *Philosophy and the Emotions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tappolet, Christine. 2012. Emotions, Perceptions, and Emotional Illusions. In Calabi Clotilde, ed. *Perceptual Illusions. Philosophical and Psychological Essays*, Basingstoke: Palgrave-Macmillan.  
[ Also available at <http://philpapers.org/profile/4942> ]
- Todd, Cain. 2014. Emotion and Value. *Philosophy Compass* 9
- Mendelovici, Angela. 2014. Pure Intentionalism About Moods and Emotions. In Uriah Kriegel, ed. *Current Controversies in Philosophy of Mind*. London: Routledge