

# Syllabus for PHIL 413.200: 18th Century Philosophy (Honors)

Tuesday & Thursday: 12:45-2:00 (YMCA 115)

Spring 2013; Dr. Stephen H. Daniel

The **18<sup>th</sup> Century Philosophy** (Honors) course develops in students the ability to write and speak effectively about how major figures of modern philosophy (George Berkeley, David Hume, Immanuel Kant) address questions regarding knowledge, nature, mind, freedom, and God. There are no prerequisites for this course.

The texts on which we will focus are available online and in many editions:

- George Berkeley, *Principles of Human Knowledge* and *Dialogues between Hylas and Philonous*
- David Hume, *An Enquiry concerning Human Understanding* and *Dialogues concerning Natural Religion*
- Immanuel Kant, *Prolegomena to Any Future Metaphysics*

Most of our texts are available in *Readings in Modern Philosophy*, ed. Roger Ariew and Eric Watkins [AW]; supplementary readings can be found at links on the course website. Recommended background reading: Frederick Copleston, *History of Philosophy*, vols. 5-6.

<u>Jan.</u>	15	17 <sup>th</sup> C. background: Descartes/Malebranche	<u>Mar.</u>	19	Hume: <i>Dialogues</i> Preamble & Dialogue I
	17	17 <sup>th</sup> C. background: Locke		21	Hume: <i>Dialogues</i> II-VI
	22	Berkeley: <i>Principles</i> Introduction		26	Hume: <i>Dialogues</i> VII-X
	24	Berkeley: <i>Principles</i> I: 1-49		28	Hume: <i>Dialogues</i> XI-XII
	29	Berkeley: <i>Principles</i> I: 50-100			<b>Essay 3: Hume, <i>Treatise</i> I.iv.6 &amp; Appendix (due Mar. 31)</b>
	31	Berkeley: <i>Principles</i> I: 101-156			
		<b>Essay 1 PHK I: <i>Dialogues</i> I (AW 175-85) (due Feb. 3)</b>	<u>Apr.</u>	2	Kant: <i>Prolegomena</i> Preface pp. 1-8
<u>Feb.</u>	5	Berkeley: <i>Dialogues</i> I (AW 185-95)		4	Kant: <i>Prolegomena</i> §§ 1-5
	7	Berkeley: <i>Dialogues</i> II (AW 195-205)		9	Kant: <i>Prolegomena</i> §§ 6-13
	12	Berkeley: <i>Dialogues</i> III (AW 205-15)		11	Kant: <i>Prolegomena</i> §§ 14-28
	14	Berkeley: <i>Dialogues</i> III (AW 215-23)		16	Kant: <i>Prolegomena</i> §§ 29-39
	19	Hume: <i>Enquiry</i> I-III		18	Kant: <i>Prolegomena</i> §§ 40-49
	21	Hume: <i>Enquiry</i> IV-V			<b>Essay 4: <i>Prolegomena</i> §§ 50-56 (due Apr. 21)</b>
		<b>Essay 2: Hume: <i>Enquiry</i> VI-VII (due Feb. 24)</b>		23	Kant: <i>Prolegomena</i> §§57-60
	26	Hume: <i>Enquiry</i> VIII-IX		25	Kant: <i>Prolegomena</i> , Solution/Appendix 99-116
	28	Hume: <i>Enquiry</i> X-XI		30	[No class: redefined Friday class]
<u>Mar.</u>	5	Hume: <i>Enquiry</i> XII	<u>May</u>	2	(Thursday) Paper drafts due
	7	<b>Mid-semester exam</b> (in class)		5	(Sunday) Paper final versions due
				8	(Wednesday) <b>Final exam 8:00-10:00</b> (in class)

- The **semester grade** is based on:
  - four 500-word essays on [questions regarding the readings](#) (10 pts each); due as email attachments by midnight on Sunday.
  - mid-semester and final exams: two previously announced questions each (both 20 points).
  - 10-page research paper (20 points). If you write a 20-page paper instead (for 30 pts), you can drop one of the questions on the final exam. Guidelines for the paper are on the reverse of this sheet.
- There is no separate grade for attendance or participation, but both affect the grading of essays and exams.
- You need to **outline readings** (based on [questions posted on the course website](#)) to prepare to discuss in class the main claims, arguments, objections, and unclear issues. If you don't understand something in the reading, **consult with others** on the course Facebook site **before** class so that you are prepared.
- If you miss a class, either send me short answers to [the questions](#) or come to my office hours so I can provide you feedback and you don't get behind.
- To communicate with me about grades or graded material, use [filex.tamu.edu](http://filex.tamu.edu).
- If you miss the mid-semester or final exam, contact me immediately. My expectations of the quality of essays rise if essays are submitted past deadlines; grades are assessed accordingly.
- Minimum grades: 88=A, 78=B, 68=C, 57=D.

**Office hours** (YMCA 417): Tues/Thurs 11:00-12:30, 2:00-3:30 (and by appt. after 5:00). **Phone:** 845-5619 (office), 324-4199 (cell). **Email:** [sdaniel@tamu.edu](mailto:sdaniel@tamu.edu). **Website:** [philosophy.tamu.edu/%7Esdaniel/413sy13a.html](http://philosophy.tamu.edu/%7Esdaniel/413sy13a.html).

Students with disabilities are guaranteed a learning environment that provides for reasonable accommodation of their disabilities. If you believe you have a disability requiring an accommodation, please contact the Dept of Student Life, [Disability Services](#), Cain Hall B118, or call 845-1637.

Students are bound by the Aggie honor code not to lie, cheat, steal, or tolerate those who do. If you violate the code (e.g., by plagiarizing something from the Internet), you will fail the course. For information on cheating and plagiarism, go to <http://www.tamu.edu/aggiehonor/>.

## Your Modern Philosophy Research Paper

1. **Selecting a topic.** Based on your reading or class discussions, choose a topic (e.g., “Berkeley’s Master Argument,” “Hume’s Ambivalence about Personal Identity”) and have it approved by me. It should be narrow enough to be the proper topic for a 10-page treatment (roughly 3000 words). A [list of possible topics](#) can be found on the course website.
2. **Developing a Thesis.** Your paper must be based on an examination of at least six or seven secondary sources (commentaries on what your philosopher thinks about an issue). Only after researching the literature will you be in a position to determine how commentators differ in their interpretations and how you might be able to appropriate them in your paper. These sources will help you locate places in your philosopher’s writings (the “primary sources”) that you quote *and comment on*. You should quote mainly from your philosopher’s texts, not from secondary sources.
3. **Structure of the Paper.** This paper is an expository paper. It identifies an interpretive issue in the scholarship, compares various options that have been proposed to handle the issue, and proposes a way to reconcile those options. It is not an opportunity for you to agree or disagree with your philosopher’s view on the topic. Instead, in the paper you should indicate how points raised by various interpreters draw on remarks by your figure (e.g., Kant). Your contribution should be to show how, drawing on the insights of the interpreters, you can come up with a thesis that accommodates their different insights. In some cases, that means saying something like “to the extent that...” your philosopher (e.g., Hume) is talking about a topic (e.g., freedom) in one way, he means X, but “insofar as” he is understood as referring to the topic in a different way, he means Y. Notice how this allows you to express your own definite thesis by highlighting how you qualify your interpretation in a distinctive way. It is this proposal that is your thesis, your contribution to the scholarship. Here is the structure of your paper:
  - a) after the title (e.g., “Berkeley on Spiritual Substances” or “Kant’s Treatment of God”), you should have one or two paragraphs that identify the issue and questions raised in the scholarly literature on how to interpret his view, and the order of your treatment and main points to be made.
  - b) each section of the paper should have a title and be at least 3-4 pages long. For a 10-page paper, there will be no more than three sections (in addition to introductory and concluding remarks). A 20-page paper will not necessarily have more sections, just longer ones.
  - c) a final brief (less than a page) section, entitled “Concluding Remarks,” indicating how the issues you raise clarify the problems raised by your philosopher and his interpreters.
  - d) footnote citations should adopt the following format:

(author, book)	Nicholas Jolley, <i>The Light of the Soul: Theories of Ideas in Leibniz, Malebranche, and Descartes</i> (New York: Oxford University Press, 1990), 32-35.
(translator)	Nicholas Malebranche, <i>The Search after Truth</i> , III.2.6, in <i>The Search after Truth and Elucidations of the Search after Truth</i> , trans. Thomas M. Lennon and Paul Olscamp (Columbus: Ohio State University Press, 1980), 230.
(essay in book)	Steven Nadler, “Intentionality in the Arnauld-Malebranche Debate,” in <i>Minds, Ideas, and Objects: Essays on the Theory of Representation in Modern Philosophy</i> , ed. Phillip D. Cummins and Guenter Zoeller (Atascadero, CA: Ridgeview Publishing Co., 1992), 78.
(journal article)	Monte Cook, “The Ontological Status of Malebranchian Ideas,” <i>Journal of the History of Philosophy</i> 36 (1998), 538-39.

Any citations of a work referred to in previous notes should list simply the author’s last name and an abbreviated title (for example: Cook, “Ontological Status,” 538). You should use standard sources, never anthologies: if you don’t know whether a source is standard, ask me. Avoid endnotes and bibliographies, and do not waste paper with a cover sheet.