

**THE UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN ONTARIO
DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY
Undergraduate Course Outline 2015-16**

Philosophy 2202G: Early Modern Philosophy

Winter Term 2016	Instructor: Benjamin Hill
TC303	StvH 3142
T 10:30-12:20	Office Hours: 11:30-12:30 Wed. and Thurs.
Th 10:30-11:20	Virtual Office Hours: Th 7:00-8:00 pm
	519-661-2111 x80143
	Email: Please use OWL
	bhill28@uwo.ca

DESCRIPTION

A critical examination of key works of selected figures and works of the 17th and 18th centuries. We will be considering Montaigne, Descartes, Cavendish, Leibniz, Locke, Bayle, Berkeley, and Hume.

Prerequisites: None

Antirequisites: None

Unless you have either the requisites for this course or written special permission from your Dean to enroll in it, you may be removed from this course and it will be deleted from your record. This decision may not be appealed. You will receive no adjustment to your fees in the event that you are dropped from a course for failing to have the necessary prerequisites.

COURSE OBJECTIVES

Attendance is mandatory for this course and unexcused absences will adversely affect the student's grade. See Methods of Evaluation for information about how attendance is graded.

The objectives of this course include:

1. Being able to describe and appreciate the major trends of early modern philosophy ;
2. Being able to describe and articulate the primary arguments and philosophical vision of Michael Montaigne's Apology for Raymond Sebond;
3. Being able to describe and articulate the primary arguments and philosophical vision of René Descartes' Meditations and Objections and Replies;
4. Being able to describe and articulate the primary arguments and philosophical vision of Margaret Cavendish's Philosophical Letters;
5. Being able to describe and articulate the primary arguments and philosophical vision of various works by Gottfried Leibniz;
6. Being able to describe and articulate the primary arguments and philosophical vision of John Locke's Essay concerning Human Understanding;
7. Being able to describe and articulate the primary arguments and philosophical vision of

- Catherine Trotter Cockburn's Defense of John Locke;
8. Being able to describe and articulate the primary arguments and philosophical vision of selections from Pierre Bayle's Historical and Critical Dictionary;
 9. Being able to describe and articulate the primary arguments and philosophical vision of George Berkeley's Dialogues between Hylas and Philonous;
 10. Being able to describe and articulate the primary arguments and philosophical vision of David Hume's Inquiry concerning the Human Understanding.

TEXTS

Michel de Montaigne. *Apology for Raymond Sebond*. Translated by Roger Ariew and Marjorie Grene. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 2003. ISBN 0872206793. (Available as an e-book from the publisher.)

Margaret Atherton, ed.. *Women Philosophers of the Early Modern Period*. (Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 1994. ISBN 9780872202597.

Roger Ariew and Eric Watkins, eds.. *Modern Philosophy: An Anthology of Primary Sources*. 2nd edition. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 2009. ISBN 9780872209787.

METHODS OF EVALUATION

Mid-term Examinations (15% each; 30% in total) There will be two mid-term examination. The date of the first examination is Thursday Feb. 11. The date of the second is Thursday Mar. 17. The students' aims should be to display a mastery of the philosophical material presented in the readings and class discussion. The focus of the exam will be on the ideas, doctrines, and arguments presented in class and in the readings. Students will be expected to present the ideas, doctrines, or arguments, to highlight their philosophically salient features, explain in detail how they work or fit together, and identify any crucial unstated assumptions on which they rely. Students may also be asked to briefly assess an idea, doctrine, or argument and provide specific reasons in support of his or her assessment. Students may also be asked to compare and contrast ideas, doctrines, or arguments between or among various authors or texts.

Final Examination (30%) There will be a cumulative, three hour final examination worth 30% of the student's grade. The exam will be administered at the date, time, and location to be dictated by the Registrar's Office. Like the mid-term examination, the final examination will be devoted to displaying a mastery of the philosophical material presented in the readings and class discussion. Students will be expected to describe and present the ideas, doctrines, or arguments, to highlight their philosophically salient features, explain in detail how they work or fit together, and identify any crucial unstated assumptions. Students may also be asked to assess an idea, doctrine, or argument and provide specific reasons in support of that assessment. Students should also expect to be able to compare and contrast ideas, doctrines, or arguments between or among various authors or texts.

Term Paper (30%) All students are required to submit a 1250-1500 word term paper. The paper is due at midnight Tuesday April 5th. It is the student's responsibility to make sure that the paper is uploaded or emailed *before* midnight according to the upload/email timestamp. Take steps to ensure that your paper is not refused or counted late because of a slight error in timing. Late

papers are assessed a 5% deduction per day until Thursday April 7th. No papers can be accepted after midnight on Thursday April 7th per departmental and Senate policy. As of Thursday April 7th, all students who have failed to submit a paper will be awarded a score of 0. Papers failing to fall within the required word count will not be accepted and will not be considered submissions; they will be awarded a score of 0 for the assignment.

Each paper should *defend* a philosophically important and interesting *thesis*. What this means is that your papers should not be simply expository, but must be analytic papers in that they will present an argument in defense of a substantive philosophical claim. There are a variety of types of acceptable papers ranging from *analyzing* an argument or doctrine, philosophically *assessing* an argument or doctrine, *interpreting* the doctrine or argument of a certain figure, *critiquing an interpretation* that another has offered of a figure's doctrine or argument, or *defending an interpretation* against the critique of another. Authors should clearly state their thesis, construct a clear, coherent, and plausible argument in support of their thesis, and anticipate and respond to one or two potential objections to their thesis or argument. Papers will be graded on the following grounds: the historical and philosophical significance of the thesis; the power and adequacy of the argument marshalled in defense of the thesis; the use of the primary texts; the nature of the secondary sources selected and how they are used in the argument; the significance, interest, and power of the potential objection(s) raised; and the clarity, coherence, and plausibility with which the authors dispatch the objection(s) raised. The foci should be on the thesis and the argument developed in defense of it, but in so far as clarity, grammatical and semantical ability, and style are necessary preconditions for the power or impact of the thesis and its defense, they will be taken into account in the grading of each paper. Because thesis selection and development are part of the philosophical process and will be graded here, topics and paper questions are not provided to the students. Students who have questions about this are strongly encouraged to ask for assistance or advice at the earliest possible time. Students are strongly encouraged to seek out and use only reliable, scholarly vetted and peer-reviewed sources. For example, wikipedia and self-published web or blog postings are prima facie frowned upon and should be used with extreme caution. Students choosing to use such material rather than peer-reviewed articles and books or webposting recommended by the instructor should be prepared to justify his or her selection and use of such material.

Attendance (10%) All students are required to attend every class. A sign-in sheet will be distributed. Attendance does not connote mere physical presence in the classroom. It requires paying attention and not engaging in rude, disruptive, or disrespectful behavior during the class. Examples of such behavior include, but are not limited to: texting, checking email, reading the newspaper, reading material for another class, chatting or joking during class, surfing the internet, internet shopping, etc.. The instructor reserves the right to strike any person's name from the attendance roll for engaging in the above, or any other such disruptive or disrespectful behavior. Students are awarded 2.70 points per hour of class attended.

Non-medical absences will be accommodated by the instructor with sufficient explanation and documentation for the absence. Late assignments and missed deadlines will also be accommodated by the instructor with sufficient explanation and documentation. Documentation must be submitted by the student directly to the appropriate Faculty Dean's office and not to the instructor. It will be the Dean's office that will determine if accommodation is warranted.

The Policy on Accommodation for Medical Illness is here:

<https://studentservices.uwo.ca/secure/index.cfm>

For accommodations of work worth less than 10% of the total course grade, documentation and decanal approval is not necessary.

No electronic devices or printed materials are allowed during examinations.

ADDITIONAL POLICIES

The **Department of Philosophy Policies** which govern the conduct, standards, and expectations for student participation in Philosophy courses is available in the Undergraduate section of the Department of Philosophy website at

<http://www.uwo.ca/philosophy/undergraduate/policies.html>. It is your responsibility to understand the policies set out by the Senate and the Department of Philosophy, and thus ignorance of these policies cannot be used as grounds of appeal.

The policy of the Department of Philosophy is that all written work must be submitted to turnitin.com. See <http://uwo.ca/philosophy/undergraduate/policies.html>.

All required papers may be subject to submission for textual similarity review to the commercial plagiarism detection software under license to the University for the detection of plagiarism. All papers submitted for such checking will be included as source documents in the reference database for the purpose of detecting plagiarism of papers subsequently submitted to the system. Use of the service is subject to the licensing agreement, currently between The University of Western Ontario and Turnitin.com (<http://www.turnitin.com>).

Computer-marked multiple-choice tests and/or exams may be subject to submission for similarity review by software that will check for unusual coincidences in answer patterns that may indicate cheating.

Students who are in emotional/mental distress should refer to Mental Health@Western (<http://www.uwo.ca/uwocom/mentalhealth/>) for a complete list of options about how to obtain help.

Registrarial Services (<http://www.registrar.uwo.ca>)

Student Support Services (<http://westernusc.ca/services/>)

AUDITING

Students wishing to audit the course should consult with the instructor prior to or during the first week of classes.

TENTATIVE READING SCHEDULE:

Readings from Ariew and Grene's *Montaigne: Apology for Raymond Sebond* are prefaced by [AG]; readings from Atherton's *Women Philosophers in the Early Modern Period* are prefaced by [A]; readings from Ariew and Watkins' *Modern Philosophy* are prefaced by [AW].

Date	Topic	Required Reading	Suggested Readings
Jan 5 (Tues)	Intellectual Crises	[AG] pp. 1-48	
The Rise of Skepticism			
Jan 7 (Thurs)	Montaigne: <i>Sebond</i>	[AG] pp.48-121.	
Jan 12 (Tues)	Montaigne: <i>Sebond</i>	[AG] pp.121-164.	
Jan 14 (Thurs)	Bacon: <i>Idols</i>	[AW] 16-20.	
Jan 19 (Tues)	Descartes: <i>Meditations</i>	[AW] pp. 35-43.	Descartes, [AW] 25-33.
Jan 21 (Thurs)	Descartes: <i>Meditations</i>	[AW] pp. 43-47.	
Jan 26 (Tues)	Descartes: <i>Meditations</i>	[AW] pp. 47-54.	
Jan 28 (Thurs)	2nd & 4th Obj. and Replies	[AW] pp. 69-75 and 83-92.	
Feb 2 (Tues)	Descartes: <i>Meditations</i>	[AW] pp. 61-68.	Descartes, [AW] 33-34; Spinoza, [AW] 93-99.
Feb 4 (Thurs)	Elisabeth: Corr. w/ Descartes	[A] pp. 9-21.	Malebranche, [AW], 212-223.
Feb 9 (Tues)	Cavendish: <i>Phil Letters</i>	[A] 22-39.	Leibniz, [AW] 99-105.
Feb 11 (Thurs)	**Midterm Exam**		
Feb 16 (Tues)	Reading Week		
Feb 18 (Thurs)	Reading Week		
Reactions to Descartes			
Feb 23 (Tues)	Leibniz: <i>Monadology</i>	[AW] pp. 275-283.	Conway, [A], 46-76.
Feb 25 (Thurs)	Leibniz: Corr. w/ Arnauld	[AW] pp. 248-254.	Leibniz, [AW] 228-245.
Mar 1 (Tues)	Leibniz: Corr. w/ Arnauld	[AW] pp. 254-264.	Leibniz, [AW] 265-274.
Mar 3 (Thurs)	Cudworth: Corr. w/ Leibniz	[A] pp. 77-89.	Leibniz, [AW]

			422-433.
Mar 8 (Tues)	Boyle: <i>Corpuscular Phil</i> Locke: <i>Essay</i>	[AW] pp. 308-315 and 322-337	Galileo, [AW] 21-24; Malebranche, [AW] 200-212.
Mar 10 (Thurs)	Locke: <i>Essay</i>	[AW] pp. 359-367.	Locke, [AW] 367-377; Trotter, [A] 126-146.
Mar 15 (Tues)	Locke: <i>Essay</i>	[AW] pp.386-405 and 411-415.	
Mar 17 (Thurs)	**Midterm Exam**		
Reactions to Locke			
Mar 22 (Tues)	Berkeley: <i>Dialogues</i>	[AW] pp. 454-468. 465-474.	Bayle, [AW] 512-516.
Mar 24 (Thurs)	Berkeley: <i>Dialogues</i>	[AW] pp. 468-474.	Shepherd, [A] 147-159; Berkeley, [AW] 438-446.
Mar 29 (Tues)	Berkeley: <i>Dialogues</i>	[AW] pp. 484-497.	Berkeley, [AW] 475-484.
Mar 31 (Thurs)	Hume: <i>Enquiry</i>	[AW] pp. 538-542	
Apr 5 (Tues)	Hume: <i>Enquiry</i>	[AW] pp. 542-555 and 556-564.	