Instructor: Dr. Benjamin Hill (he/him/his)  
Voicemail: 519.661.2111 (x80143)  
Student Hours:  
- TBA  
- By appointment  
Contact: OWL Messages  

GTA: TBA  
Student Hours: TBA  
Contact: OWL Messages

LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT
We acknowledge that Western University is located on the traditional lands of the Anishinaabek, Haudenosaunee, Lūnaapéewak, and Attawandaron peoples, on lands connected with the London Township and Sombra Treaties of 1796 and the Dish with One Spoon Covenant Wampum. With this, we respect the longstanding relationships that Indigenous Nations have to this land, as they are the original caretakers. We acknowledge historical and ongoing injustices that Indigenous Peoples (e.g., First Nations, Métis, and Inuit) endure in Canada, and we accept responsibility as a public institution to contribute toward revealing and correcting miseducation as well as renewing respectful relationships with Indigenous communities through our teaching, research, and community service.

COURSE DESCRIPTION
Contemporary Western philosophy (both the Anglo-American and Continental streams) often traces its source to the texts and themes of Western early modern philosophy. It is common for René Descartes to be presented as "the father of modern philosophy" and for contemporary practitioners to label themselves or their positions as "Kantian," "Humean," or "Cartesian." It is also common for classes dedicated to contemporary Western treatments of philosophical topics to begin with selected readings from Western early modern texts. But philosophy in the early modern period (1550–1800 CE) was also its own endeavor, a unique set of philosophical thinkers working within various traditions and against various historical and cultural

COURSE GOAL
This course introduces students to the study of Western early modern philosophy. This includes introducing them to the unique methodology used by historians of early modern philosophy as well as providing guidance regarding good practices. Also introduced will be some of the key figures, texts, topics, and themes that dominated philosophical practice in Western Europe during the early modern period (1550–1800).
backgrounds to wrestle with challenges and concerns both universal to the human condition as well as unique to their own times and periods. This course introduces students to several key figures, texts, topics, and themes that arose within the Western European philosophical tradition during the early modern era. It also introduces students to the unique intellectual activity of the history of philosophy and will develop their abilities to use, appreciate, and engage in research in the history of early modern philosophy. Students enrolled in the course can expect to study selected texts from Michel de Montaigne, René Descartes, Princess Elisabeth, Margaret Cavendish, Gottfried Leibniz, John Locke, George Berkeley, David Hume, Thomas Hobbes, Bernard Mandeville, Joseph Butler, Baruch Spinoza, Mary Astell, Marie Jean Antoine Nicolas de Caritat Marquis de Condorcet, Olympe de Gouges, Julien Raimond, Ottobah Cugoano, and Mary Wollstonecraft. Students can also expect exercises and activities that will develop their abilities to interpret historical texts, defend their interpretations, and assess the interpretations of others.

This is a theoretical course in academic philosophy. This means that it is focused on knowledge development and learning outcomes involving understanding the readings and developing the skills necessary for philosophy as practiced by academics. Regular attendance, preparation, and full engagement with class discussions are essential to properly experiencing the course.

I have created a public Trello Board for the course that contains all the course material (and some bonus material). It may be accessed here.

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.

PREFERRED NAMES AND PRONOUNS
If you prefer to be called something other than the name on file with the Registrar, please let us know. Please also feel free to specify the pronoun(s) you wish to be referred to by. If anyone mispronounces your name or forgets your preferred name/pronoun, please correct them. I always greatly appreciate being corrected when I mispronounce or forget someone’s preferred name/pronoun.
COURSE LEARNING OUTCOMES
See Appendix 1 for the alignment of the course learning outcomes with the program and Western degree learning outcomes.

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

1. **Articulate** the major themes that animated philosophical discourse in the early modern period, primarily in Western Europe, in oral and written contexts.
2. **Restate** and **Explain** the primary theories and arguments examined in this course in oral and written contexts.
3. **Question** the theories and arguments presented by the figures and texts studied in oral and written contexts.
4. **Apply** knowledge about the intellectual contexts of the figures and texts studied to interpretations of those texts in oral and written contexts.
5. **Compare** and **Contrast** interpretations of the figures and texts studied in oral and written contexts.
6. **Collect** and **Arrange** premises and conclusion(s) from the texts studied into rigorous argument reconstructions in oral and written contexts.
7. **Construct** coherent and plausible contextualist defenses of their own interpretations and reconstructions in oral and written contexts.
8. **Evaluate** from a contextualist standpoint the coherence and plausibility of interpretations in oral and written contexts.

ICLICKER CLOUD
We will be using iClicker Cloud for in-class activities and participation. iClicker Cloud is a centrally supported active learning tool. Information about the tool and Western’s support of it can be located at Western’s eLearning Toolkit and Western ITS. See also the iClicker website. This tool requires students to download an app to their laptop, smartphone, or tablet. Information about loading the app can be found at the iClicker website linked above and will be presented in class. We will be using this tool to track student attendance as well as for extra credit points for the Reading Response Questions. Students receive +2 extra credit points for participating in the iClicker Cloud activities and +3 extra credit points when they select the correct answer. For more information about how we will be using iClicker Cloud, see Appendix 2.

METHODS OF EVALUATION
All assignments are due at 23:59:59 Eastern on their specified due dates and must be submitted via OWL. Assignments that have an automatic 48-hour grace period may be submitted via OWL as “late” but without any late penalty. To submit an assignment after the 48-hour grace period, when the OWL submission portal has closed, contact Dr. Hill and, if necessary, your Academic Dean, regarding an academic accommodation and alternative submission date. Assignments that are designated “Pass/Fail” will be scored...
as follows: Pass with Distinction = 100; Pass = 70; Fail (with submission) = 40; No Submission = 0.

Readings Review Questions (10%)
Short Interpretative Essay (20%)
Midterm Examination (30%)
Final Examination (40%)

Readings Review Questions (10%) [Formative Assessment] [Learning Outcomes: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8]
Students are required to answer questions about each of the assigned readings. The questions will be a mix of Study Questions from the textbook and questions authored by Dr. Hill. The questions will be located in OWL Quizzes and Tests and will be graded Pass/Fail. Responses that fail to be relevant to the prompt, fail to adequately or appropriately respond to the prompt, or are manifestly wrong may warrant a failing mark for the assignment. These assessments are eligible for the automatic 48-hour grace period. They are due one week after the class in which the assigned reading are discussed.

Short Interpretative Essay (20%) [Summative Assessment] [Learning Outcomes: 6, 7, 8]
Students are required to write a short (750–1000 word) essay providing a coherent and plausible philosophical interpretation of a selected passage from our assigned texts. The eligible passages will be specified in the OWL Assignment Information. The assignment is eligible for the automatic 48-hour grace period and will be graded numerically and qualitatively. It is due at 23:59:59 Eastern on TBD. For more information about this and a guide to the process of interpreting texts, please see Appendix 3.

Midterm Examination (30%) [Summative Assessment] [Learning Outcomes: 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8]
Students are required to write a timed (90 min) midterm examination. The examination will be administered via OWL Tests & Quizzes and will be open book/notes/resources. It will be graded numerically. Students will be provided with a 72-hour window in which to write the exam, which will consist of a mix of question types including true/false, fill in the blank, multiple choice, and short answer questions. The exam will be due at 23:59:59 Eastern on TBD and cover material including TBD.

Final Examination (40%) [Summative Assessment] [Learning Outcomes: 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8]
Students are required to write a cumulative, 3-hour final examination. The final examination will be administered via OWL Tests & Quizzes and will be open book/notes/resources. It will be graded numerically and consist of a mix of question-
types. Students will be given a 72-hour window by the Registrar (TBD) in which to write
the examination.

Extra Credit Opportunities [Learning Outcomes: 1, 2, 3, 8]
Opportunities for extra credit may be made available throughout the term. Some may be
for extra credit on the score of a particular assignment; some may be for extra credit on
one’s course grade. All opportunities will be announced on OWL with the expectations
and potential credits specified.

- **ExCr Opportunity #1: “Critical Review” Due TBD** [Learning outcomes: 1, 2,
3, 8] Max +10 points on your final grade. Graded by Dr. Hill.
  Details of the assignment and rubric are contained in Appendix 4. Only projects
  that have received prior special permission from Dr. Hill will be graded. Deadline for Receiving Permission: TBD. The resources available
  for review are:
    a) Peter Adamson and Chike Jeffers, “Africana Philosophy,” episodes 1 and 9–
39, released 31 Mar 2018 through 10 November 2019, History of Philosophy
without any Gaps, by Peter Adamson, podcast, 14:20
    https://historyofphilosophy.net/series/africana-philosophy;
    b) Richard King, Indian Philosophy: An Introduction to Hindu and Buddhist
Thought, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2008. (Available as an e-
book via Weldon.)
    c) Toby Huff, The Rise of Early Modern Science: Islam, China, and the West,
e-book via Weldon.)

Essay Course Word Count
As a course that satisfies the senior-level essay course requirement, students enrolled in
this course should expect to submit a minimum of 2500 words of written work.

Department Target Average Policy
The Philosophy Department has a policy requiring a 74 average for each 2nd-year course.
The grades I assign will be in the OWL Gradebook. Should there be any discrepancy
between the grade I recorded for you in OWL and your “official” grade reported by the
Registrar, you should contact the Philosophy Department Undergraduate Chair for
clarification and explanation. Western’s current policies and procedures for
undergraduate student academic appeals can be found here.

STUDENT ABSENCES
If you are unable to meet a course requirement due to illness or other serious
circumstances, please follow the procedures below.
Philosop 2202G:  
[Western] Early Modern Philosophy  
Course Outline 2023–24  
Dr. Benjamin Hill

Assessments worth less than 10% of the overall course grade:  
Please submit the assessment to Dr. Hill via OWL Messages before the final day of classes.

Assessments worth 10% or more of the overall course grade:  
For work totalling 10% or more of the final course grade, you must provide valid medical or supporting documentation to the Academic Counselling Office of your Faculty of Registration as soon as possible. For further information, please consult the University’s medical illness policy at  

The Student Medical Certificate is available at  

Absences from Final Examinations  
If you miss the Final Exam, please contact the Academic Counselling office of your Faculty of Registration as soon as you are able to do so. They will assess your eligibility to write the Special Examination (the name given by the University to a makeup Final Exam).

You may also be eligible to write the Special Exam if you are in a “Multiple Exam Situation” (e.g., more than 2 exams in a 23-hour period, more than 3 exams in a 47-hour period).

REQUIRED TEXT  

OWL  
Students are responsible for checking the course OWL site (http://owl.uwo.ca) on a regular basis for news and updates. This is the primary method by which information will be disseminated to all students in the class.

All course material will be posted to OWL: http://owl.uwo.ca.

If students need assistance with the course OWL site, they can seek support on the OWL Help page. Alternatively, they can contact the Western Technology Services Helpdesk. They can be contacted by phone at 519-661-3800 or ext. 83800.
COURSE SOCIAL MEDIA
In addition to our official OWL site, we have a course website and blog as well as social media presence.
  
  Website and blog:  
  Facebook public page: http://www.facebook.com/WEModPhil  
  Twitter: https://twitter.com/DrBenjaminHill1

To receive credit for any public event or social media challenge, your posting must include the official course tags. Students without any social media presence or who wish not to post anything that might compromise their personal privacy to social media should contact Prof. Hill regarding alternative ways of documenting their participation or meeting the social media challenge(s).
  
  @drbenjaminhill1  
  @WEModPhil  
  #2202westernearlymodphil  
  #westernearlymodphil2020  
  #westernu

PROFESSIONALISM
Education is a professional activity and campus is a professional environment. Everyone is expected to comport themselves in a manner appropriate for and conducive to such an environment. All academic activities, interactions, and conversations should be conducted in a respectful, inclusive, and professional manner. Judgemental, belittling, shaming, rude, ridiculing, bullying, and all other such behavior, comments, and attitudes are inappropriate and will not be tolerated. We require that all discussions be respectful and kind even when that discussion is critical, defensive, emotional, and contradictory.

COPYRIGHT
All original material presented in this course is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommerical-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License:

© Benjamin Hill, 2024

AUDIT
Students wishing to audit the course should consult with the instructor prior to or during the first week of classes.
DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY POLICIES
The Department of Philosophy Policies which govern the conduct, standards, and expectations for student participation in Philosophy courses are available in the Undergraduate section of the Department of Philosophy website here. 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 for appeal.

ACCOMMODATION
Students seeking academic accommodation on medical grounds for any missed tests, exams, participation components and/or assignments worth 10% or more of their final grade must apply to the Academic Counselling office of their home Faculty and provide documentation. Academic accommodation cannot be granted by the instructor or department. Documentation shall be submitted, as soon as possible, to the Office of the Dean of the student’s Faculty of registration, together with a request for relief specifying the nature of the accommodation being requested. The Western Policy on Accommodation for Medical Illness and further information regarding this policy can be found here.

Religious Accommodation
Students should consult the University’s list of recognized religious holidays, and should give reasonable notice in writing, prior to the holiday, to the Instructor and an Academic Counsellor if their course requirements will be affected by a religious observance. Additional information is given in the Western Multicultural Calendar.

Accessibility Accommodation
Students with disabilities are encouraged to contact Accessible Education, which provides recommendations for accommodation based on medical documentation or psychological and cognitive testing. The policy on Academic Accommodation for Students with Disabilities can be found at:


EVALUATION OF ACADEMIC PERFORMANCE
At least three days prior to the deadline for withdrawal from a course without academic penalty, students will receive an assessment of work accounting for at least 15% of their final grade. For 3000- or 4000-level courses in which such a graded assessment is impracticable, the instructor(s) must obtain an exemption from this policy from the Dean and this exemption must be noted on the corresponding course syllabus. In rare instances and at the Dean’s discretion, other courses could receive a similar exemption, which also must be noted in the course syllabus.

For Philosop 2202G the following grade, which is worth 30% of your final grade, will be
available prior to TBD:
  • Midterm Examination

**FINAL COURSE SUBMISSION DATE**
The last day of scheduled classes in any course will be the last day on which course assignments will be accepted for credit in a course. Instructors will be required to return assignments to students as promptly as possible with reasonable explanations of the instructor's assessment of the assignment.

**ACADEMIC OFFENCES**
Scholastic offences are taken seriously, and students are directed to read the appropriate policy, specifically, the definition of what constitutes a Scholastic Offence, [here](#).

**PLAGIARISM CHECKING**
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](#).

**SUPPORT SERVICES**
- Registrarial Services
- Student Support Services
- Services provided by the USC
- Student Development Centre

**Academic Counselling**
Your Home Faculty's Academic Counselling or Academic Advising Office will support or refer you whenever you have an issue that is affecting your studies, including information on adding/dropping courses, academic considerations for absences, appeals, exam conflicts, and many other academic-related matters. Do not hesitate to reach out to them if you are struggling and unsure where to go for help. Contact info for all Faculties is here: [https://registrar.uwo.ca/faculty_academic_counselling.html](https://registrar.uwo.ca/faculty_academic_counselling.html)

**Mental Health Support**
Students who are in emotional/mental distress should refer to Mental Health@Western ([https://uwo.ca/health/](https://uwo.ca/health/)) for a complete list of options about how to obtain help.

**Gender-based and sexual violence**
Western is committed to reducing incidents of gender-based and sexual violence and providing compassionate support to anyone who has gone through these traumatic events. If you have experienced sexual or gender-based violence (either recently or in the past), you will find information about support services for survivors, including emergency contacts at

https://www.uwo.ca/health/student_support-survivor_support/get-help.html

To connect with a case manager or set up an appointment, please contact support@uwo.ca.

**Accessible Education**
Please contact the course instructor if you require lecture or printed material in an alternate format or if any other arrangements can make this course more accessible to you. You may also wish to contact Accessible Education at

http://academicsupport.uwo.ca/accessible_education/index.html

if you have any questions regarding accommodations.

**Learning Development and Success**
Counsellors at the Learning Development and Success Centre https://learning.uwo.ca) are ready to help you improve your learning skills. They offer presentations on strategies for improving time management, multiple-choice exam preparation/writing, textbook reading, and more. Individual support is offered throughout the Fall/Winter terms in the drop-in Learning Help Centre, and year-round through individual counselling.

**Digital Student Experience**
Western University is committed to a thriving campus as we deliver our courses in the mixed model of both virtual and face-to-face formats. We encourage you to check out the Digital Student Experience website to manage your academics and well-being: https://www.uwo.ca/se/digital/.

**USC**
Additional student-run support services are offered by the USC, https://westernusc.ca/services/.
### Philosop 2202G: [Western] Early Modern Philosophy

**Appendix 1 (Alignment of Learning Outcomes)**

Dr. Benjamin Hill

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Aligned Philosophy Program Learning Outcomes</th>
<th>Aligned Western Degree Learning Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Articulate</strong> the major themes that animated philosophical discourse in the early modern period primarily in Western Europe in oral and written contexts.</td>
<td>HSp 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6</td>
<td>1, 2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MajP 1, 2, 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Restate</strong> and <strong>Explain</strong> the primary theories and arguments examined in this course in oral and written contexts.</td>
<td>HSp 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6</td>
<td>1, 2, 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MajP 1, 2, 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question</strong> the theories and arguments presented by the figures and texts studied in oral and written contexts.</td>
<td>HSp 2, 4, 5, 6</td>
<td>6, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MajP 2, 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Apply</strong> knowledge about the intellectual contexts of the figures and texts studied to interpretations of those texts in oral and written contexts.</td>
<td>HSp 2, 4</td>
<td>3, 5, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MajP 2, 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Compare</strong> and <strong>Contrast</strong> interpretations of the figures and texts studied in oral and written contexts.</td>
<td>HSp 2, 4</td>
<td>1, 3, 5, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MajP 2, 4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Collect</strong> and <strong>Arrange</strong> premises and conclusion(s) from the texts studied into rigorous argument reconstructions in oral and written contexts.</td>
<td>HSp 2, 4, 7</td>
<td>3, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MajP 2, 4, 6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Construct</strong> coherent and plausible contextualist defenses of their own interpretations and reconstructions in oral written contexts.</td>
<td>HSp 4, 7, 8, 10</td>
<td>4, 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MajP 4, 6, 7, 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluate</strong> from a contextualist standpoint the coherence and plausibility of interpretations in oral written contexts.</td>
<td>HSp 7, 8, 10</td>
<td>4, 6, 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MajP 6, 7, 8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I will be using iClicker to make our class time more engaging. This will help me understand what you know, give everyone a chance to participate, and increase how much you learn in class. This will also provide you with feedback on how well you are comprehending course concepts, help you master challenging concepts, and allow you to review material after class.

**Participating in my iClicker sessions will provide you with extra credit awarded to your Reading Review Questions grade. Students receive 2 pts extra credit for participating in the iClicker questions and 3 more points for getting the answer right.**

You are required to participate with the iClicker student app on a smartphone, tablet, or laptop. It is your responsibility to follow the steps below to properly get added to my iClicker course in a timely fashion. It is also your responsibility to regularly check your iClicker records for any discrepancies and bring them to my attention.

Now the fun part! Participate in my iClicker class activities.

- I have turned on a GPS location requirement for iClicker in our class. If you are not physically in class when you try to join with iClicker, you will not be counted as present and will not be able to respond to my polling/quizzing questions.
  - You will need to allow the device you are using to reveal your location in order to successfully check in.
  - If you have any issues with your device’s location settings, refer to the [Attendance Geolocation Troubleshooting Guide](#).

- When it’s time for class, make sure you have selected my course from the main screen of iClicker.
  - Select the **Join** button that appears on your screen, then answer each question I ask in iClicker.
  - For short answer, numeric, and target questions, make sure you select **Send**.

Keep track of your attendance, review your work, and study after class in iClicker.

- You can review your attendance record in iClicker, making it easy for you to manage your course attendance.
- You can review your performance and participation in iClicker.
Academic Integrity Information
iClicker activities fall under the provisions of our campus academic honesty policy. Students must not engage in academic dishonesty while participating in iClicker activities. This includes but is not limited to:
● Checking in while not physically in class
● Having another student check you into class
● Answering polling questions while not physically in class
● Looking at other students' devices while answering live questions
● Using more than one iClicker remote or account at a time

Any student found to be in violation of these rules will lose their iClicker points for the entire term and may be reported to the Academic Dean.

Need help with iClicker?
● If you are having trouble with your iClicker access code, check out this guide to access code errors.
● If you are having issues connecting to the iClicker student app, check out these iClicker connectivity tips.
● If you are having issues seeing your iClicker points, check out this troubleshooting guide.
● Find answers to other questions and contact the iClicker Tech Support Team by visiting http://iclicker.com/support at any time.
Interpretation is one of the critical skills historians of philosophy must master. (It is also valuable for practitioners of contemporary philosophy.) For historians of philosophy, it provides the object of philosophical scrutiny and assessment. So, for historians of philosophy, everything begins with an act of interpretation.

The following may be a convenient way for us to think about what an act of interpretation is: an act of interpretation = df the process of transforming a text into a philosophical object. We can identify four stages to this process.

1. Analyzing the Text
2. Mapping the Textual Analysis into a Logical Format
3. Philosophically Analyzing the Logical Format
4. Filling any Logical Gaps (or Explaining Why the Author Could Not Fill Them)

Analyzing the Text
The purpose of this is to identify what is to be interpreted and how the author presents their philosophical ideas. Typically, the texts we are interested in interpreting contain arguments, explanations, or philosophical doctrines. Sometimes these are neatly contained in a paragraph or two, but sometimes they can be spread across several pages of text. Here we are largely interested in three things: (a) identifying what the author is presenting to us (argument, explanation, or philosophical doctrine); (b) identifying where the author's presentation begins and where it ends; and (c) identifying the parts of the presentation, especially the thesis, explanandum, or core theses. The justification for a textual analysis is the passage or text itself.

Mapping the Text into a Logical Format
As your philosophical development progresses, you will learn different logical frameworks that you can map texts into. For our class, as a second-year course, we will adopt what I like to call a “quasi-logical” or “natural” framework. The logical items will be expressed in a natural, yet philosophically rigorous, language and arrayed in a logical or hierarchical order. Examples will be given in class, but the basic idea is that the text (e.g., an argument) should be mapped into something with the following form:

1. Premise A
2. Premise B
3. Sub-conclusion C1
4. Premise D
5. Premise E
6. Conclusion C

Premises and conclusions represented here should be traced back to constituents of the analyzed text. Students should recognize that there may not be a clear one-to-one
relationship between sentences in the text and premises or conclusions. And students should strive to present the ideas more clearly than they were presented in the text, which often requires using technical philosophical terminology and sometimes straying from its expression in the text being interpreted. But even when one is using language that strays from the expressions within the text, it is the text itself that justifies the mapping. And anytime we are looking at a text we need to remember the contextualist constraints that should be imposed on our reading and thinking about the text. It is especially important that we pay attention to contextualist aspects when we are paraphrasing or importing technical philosophical terminology into our expression of the philosophical meaning of the text.

Analyzing the Mapping
It is here that we begin to get philosophical. We need to philosophically analyze the argument, explanation, or doctrine that we’ve found in the text. Here the primary goal is again identification, but now we are identifying problems or weaknesses in what we’ve found in the text. Most often, these are gaps and unstated assumptions (because most arguments are enthymematic) or items that require additional support or explanation. Identifying them, and where they occur in the mapping, is important because it is a necessary condition for the fourth and final part of the interpretative process.

Filling the Gaps
Again, we need to be philosophical here. We need to supply the premises, principles, or ideas that make the mapping as coherent and cogent as it can be. This is something that we owe (not to the original author) to Philosophy itself and to all philosophers. In other words, I view this as a professional duty and trust that we have to make our interpretations as strong as we can. This does not mean that we should be adding what we think is philosophically strongest or the best or what we would add were we the author. Our additions are constrained by the contextual conditions that we impose on our thinking about the text. Furthermore, they should be constrained by our understanding of the author’s other texts and places where they commit themselves to philosophical positions. We never want to attribute to an interpretation ideas that an author would not or could not accept as part of our interpretation of a text, for that would misrepresent the text.

It is only after we have an interpretation in hand that we can begin philosophically assessing the argument, explanation, or doctrine. But that is another kind of philosophical skill that we’ll save for a later class.
The Project
Students are required to write a short (750–1000 word) essay providing a coherent and plausible philosophical interpretation of a selected passage from our assigned texts. The eligible passages will be specified in the OWL Assignment Information. The assignment is eligible for the automatic 48-hour grace period and will be graded numerically and qualitatively.

Concrete Deliverable DUE TBD
- 750–1000 word essay

Project Parameters
- Presents a coherent and cogent interpretation of the assigned passage.
- Defends that interpretation.

Assessment
Eligible for the 48-hour automatic grace period
Graded 0–100
Qualitative feedback available on request
Submit via OWL Assignments

Learning Outcomes

1. Collect and Arrange premises and conclusion(s) from the texts studied into rigorous argument reconstructions in written contexts.
2. Construct coherent and plausible contextualist defenses of their own interpretations and reconstructions in written contexts.
3. Evaluate from a contextualist standpoint the coherence and plausibility of interpretations in written contexts.
Writing a critical resource review is probably different than any other type of writing you have done before. It is helpful to start with an understanding of what a resource review is: An honest and in-depth assessment of the value of a resource by a knowledgeable authority to aid potential users/readers in deciding whether to spend their valuable time using the resource. A good review will convey the contents of the resource, but it will also do much more than that. (Hint: a crucial review is not a mere report!) A reviewer needs to have a thorough understanding of the resource and a solid, authoritative command over the field/genre, topic(s), and theme(s) covered by the resource. A reviewer also needs to have a good sense of the audience to whom the review is directed and what their interests and concerns are. Finally, a reviewer needs to recognize and understand the information that needs to be conveyed to the audience to assist their decision to use or to avoid the resource. (Hint: Simply telling readers that you enjoyed the resource or found it to be informative does almost nothing to help them determine whether they ought or ought not to use the resource.)

One of the first things a reviewer has to determine is, who is the audience? For this assignment, we will specify the audience for you: Thoughtful and reflective people who have taken or are interested in taking this course, Philosop 2202G: [Western] Early Modern Philosophy. In other words, you are writing your review for your (idealized) peers. We will also specify the audience’s interests and concerns for you: They are interested in reading what expands their understanding of major themes, figures, and texts animating philosophical discourse during the early modern era. Your job as reviewer, then, is to critically evaluate and present this resource to such a potential user/reader. Hint: Critically assessing does not mean just criticizing or finding negative things to say about the resource—it means evaluating (either positively, negatively, or a mixture of both) the critical features of the resource’s intellectual content and judging its significance and worth to the field.

RECOMMENDED PROCESS

- Initially work through the resource (if a book, read it) in its entirety, straight-through to get a good sense of its overall shape and argumentative structure.
- Compile your thoughts and notes to construct a synopsis of the resource’s content. A synopsis is like a brief abstract or overview (I’d recommend aiming for approximately 200-300 words.) The synopsis should clearly identify the main thesis of the book or resource and reconstruct its central argument.
- Situate the resource in the context of other’s work in the field on that topic. Don’t be shy about researching the topic and exploring other relevant writings and work.
- Reflect on the ideas and themes that ought to be most important for, and of most interest to, your target audience. Determine a provisional assessment for these ideas/themes and identify your reasons.
• Sketch a rough outline of how you wish to present these ideas and themes.
• Work through the resource again (reread it, if it is a book) more carefully (and slowly, if necessary) with an eye toward (a) finalizing (and narrowing, if necessary) your list of important themes and ideas, (b) finalizing (and altering as necessary) your preliminary and provisional assessments of these ideas and themes, and (c) identifying and flagging specific examples and instances within the text that illustrate and support your assessments.
• Rework and fill out your rough preliminary outline of your review.
• Add an overall assessment regarding the value of the resource as a whole and its importance for practitioners in the field.
• Draft your review (revising and finalizing as necessary).
• Ideally: Review the resource’s contents again confirming your presentation of the book’s content, your critical assessments, and your choice of examples and citations. Change or alter as necessary.
The Critical Review Extra Credit Project
Write and submit a critical resource review (minimum 1000-words) of the resource selected for the optional extra credit opportunity. In addition to describing the resource’s main theme(s), thesis, and argument(s), the review should engage critically with its thesis and argument and provide to readers an informed, insightful, and considered assessment of the lasting philosophical value of the resource and its relevance to them.

Concrete Deliverable DUE TBD
- A minimum 1000-word text document containing your critical review.
- It is permitted to include supplemental figures, illustrations, or tables (e.g., concept maps, argument maps or inference trees, tables of statistics or other information, etc.). Such supplemental representations of information will not count toward the minimum 1000-word limit.

Project Parameters
- You are providing an informed and considered assessment of the resource’s lasting value and significance for readers interested in early modern philosophy.
- You should be displaying complete mastery and command over the resource’s contents, their meaning, and their philosophical significance.
- You should clearly identify what are the key features of the resource’s thesis and the structure of its central argument(s).
- Your critical comments should be insightful, directed at core features of the resource’s argument, and supported by clear examples.
- Your critical comments should be directly connected to and intersecting with the main theme(s) of the course.

Assessment
Graded 0–100 according to the Critical Review Ex. Credit Grading Rubric
Qualitative Feedback based on the Critical Review Ex. Credit Grading Rubric upon request only
Not eligible for automatic 48-hour grace period (per University Senate regulations)

Learning Outcomes
1. Successful students will be able to articulate the main themes, topics, figures, and texts from the tradition(s) explored by their chosen resource. [1, 2]
2. Successful students will be able to explain, criticize, and assess the ideas and arguments presented as central to those tradition(s). [3]
3. Successful students will be able to compare, articulate, and critically assess traditions vis-à-vis the Western European tradition studied in the rest of the course. [4, 5, 6]
## Critical Review Extra Credit Grading Rubric

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Exemplary (4 +/-)</th>
<th>Superior (3 +/-)</th>
<th>Adequate (2 +/-)</th>
<th>Inadequate (1 +/-)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Presentation of the Resource's Thesis and Argument</td>
<td>The review accurately and honestly conveys the central theses and all the primary supportive ideas of the resource. Presents an in-depth and sophisticated precis of its overall argument and correctly identifies the most significant logical moves in the argument. Demonstrates a mastery of the author's thoughts.</td>
<td>The review accurately conveys the central theses and some of the primary supportive ideas of the resource. Presents in some detail an appropriate overview of the resource's argument and correctly identifies some of its most significant logical moves. Demonstrates a moderate understanding of the author's thoughts.</td>
<td>The review accurately identifies the central theses of the resource but ignores most of the primary supportive ideas. Presents a brief and crude outline of the resource's argumentative structure and evidentiary base. Demonstrates a limited understanding of the author's thoughts.</td>
<td>The review merely identifies the primary theme of the resource and ignores or confuses the author's theses and contributions to the theme. Misrepresents or mischaracterizes the resource's argumentative structure and evidentiary base. Demonstrates a superficial or simplified understanding of the author's thoughts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Focus on the Philosophical Themes Relevant to Intersecting Philosophical Disciplines</td>
<td>Demonstrates clearly where and how the resource intersects with the course's theme (Western early modern philosophy). Explains forcefully and compellingly the contribution(s) the resource makes to readers' conception of the nature and dynamics of Western early modern philosophy.</td>
<td>Indicates in some detail places where the resource intersects with the course's themes and explains somewhat how they intersect. Appropriately explains how the resource contributes to the development of readers' conception of the nature and dynamics of Western early modern philosophy.</td>
<td>Provides some general or vague indications of the resource's connection(s) with the material presented in the course regarding Western early modern philosophy. Provides little or inappropriate explanation for how the resource contributes to readers' understanding of the course topic.</td>
<td>Fails to consider the resource's connection with the material presented in the course regarding Western early modern philosophy. Overlooks or misidentifies the relevance of the resource for readers concerned with Western early modern philosophy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critical Assessment and Judgment of the Worth of the Resource</td>
<td>Presents insightful and well-supported assessments directed at core primary ideas or key logical moves in the argument. Clear, detailed examples from the text are presented or cited.</td>
<td>Presents assessments with an appropriate degree of support. Judgments are directed at important ideas or ideas relevant to readers interested in early modern philosophy. Examples from the text are presented or cited.</td>
<td>Presents some critical assessment with limited or unclear support. Judgments are occasionally directed at important or relevant ideas. References to the text are general, vague, or fail to support the judgments offered.</td>
<td>Critical assessment is absent or directed only at minor technical details and features irrelevant to the theses, the primary ideas, and the argument of the resource. Accusations are unsubstantiated and not supported by examples or citations from the text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completeness</td>
<td>Response includes all components and meets or exceeds all requirements indicated in the instructions. Each question or part of the assignment is addressed thoroughly.</td>
<td>Response includes all components and minimally meets all requirements indicated in the instructions. Each question or part of the assignment is addressed.</td>
<td>Response is missing some components and/or does not fully meet the requirements indicated in the instructions. Some questions or parts of the assignment are not addressed.</td>
<td>Response excludes essential components and/or does not address the requirements indicated in the instructions. Many parts of the assignment are addressed inadequately and/or not at all.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Assessment</td>
<td>100–80</td>
<td>79–70</td>
<td>69–60</td>
<td>59–50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Could not reasonably demand better work from a student at this level. 4 or greater in all areas of the rubric.</td>
<td>Above average work for students at this level. May include a 2+ in one area, if outweighed by exemplary and strongly superior marks in the remaining areas.</td>
<td>Average work for students at this level. May include exemplary marks (3- or greater) in one or two areas that are overwhelmed by adequate marks in the other areas.</td>
<td>Below average work for students at this level. May include a 2- in an area that is overwhelmed by marks from other marks.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Desiderata not specifically assessed in the rubric, but which will directly affect the grade of the review include Professional Tone, Grammar and Style, and Proofing Mistakes.