

**THE UNIVERSITY OF WESTERN ONTARIO**  
**DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY**  
**Undergraduate Course Outline 2016-17**

**Philosophy 2202G: Early Modern Philosophy**

**Winter Term 2017**

**Instructor: Benjamin Hill**

**StvH 3142**

**Office Hours:**

**T 12:30-1:30**

**W 10:30-11:30**

**519-661-2111 x80143**

**Email: Please use OWL**

**bhill28@uwo.ca**

**DESCRIPTION**

A critical examination of key works of selected Western European figures and works of the 17<sup>th</sup> and 18<sup>th</sup> centuries. We will be considering Montaigne, Descartes, Cavendish, Leibniz, Locke, Bayle, Berkeley, and Hume, among others. This is a traditional survey of largely canonical material in the history of Western European early modern philosophy. It aims to provide students with a broad familiarity of figures, texts, and themes that that third- and fourth-year courses in the honors program will mention, use, or draw upon. Decisions about the material and its narrative framework are meant to be integrated with the program in the history of philosophy as a whole. Students should consider successful completion of this course a beginning to the study of the history of early modern Western European philosophy and not equivalent to a complete and proper education of the history of early modern Western European philosophy.

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**

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*. 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, 2009. ISBN 9780872209787.

For your convenience the texts are available for purchase at the Campus Bookstore. It is the student's responsibility to secure access to the texts and waiting for delivery of the text purchased online is not a legitimate excuse for not reading the text or being prepared for class, quizzes, or assignments.

### **METHODS OF EVALUATION**

**Exegetical Essay Assignments (15% each; 45% in total)** Students are required to write and submit three (3) Exegetical Essay Assignments. Due dates for the assignments will be midnight on Feb. 6<sup>th</sup>, Mar. 15<sup>th</sup>, and Apr. 6<sup>th</sup>. Details for each assignment, including topics, questions, and dates the essay cover can be found on OWL under the "Assignments" tab. Each individual essay should be 500-750 words.

These essays should not be mere descriptions of the relevant ideas, theories, arguments, or texts. They should instead be *explanations of the meanings* of the relevant material. The difference lies in providing a philosophical analysis of the material. This means that the focus should be on inferential and/or conceptual structures, underlying and/or unstated assumptions, or crucial distinction and/or premises was warranted by the material. The expectation is that students will display a *mastery of the relevant philosophical material*. Grades for your essays will be based on the completeness and accuracy, relevance, philosophical depth and significance, and clarity of your expositions.

**Analytic Term Paper (35%)** Students are required to write and submit a 1250-1500 word analytic Term Paper. The paper is due at midnight on **Tuesday March 28<sup>th</sup>**. More details can be found on OWL under the "Assignments" tab. 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 6<sup>th</sup>. No papers can be

accepted after midnight on Thursday April 6<sup>th</sup> per departmental and Senate policy. As of Friday April 7<sup>th</sup>, all students who have failed to submit a paper will be awarded a score of 0, unless they receive decanal approval for an accommodation. 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 on Friday April 7<sup>th</sup>.

An analytic essay or paper differs from an exegetical paper because it *defends a thesis*, and in the case of a philosophical essay or paper the thesis should be a philosophically important and interesting one. *A defense of a thesis* is an argument that shows the truth of the thesis. Because this is a course in the history of philosophy, your paper should be appropriate for the methodology of the history of philosophy. There are a variety of types of projects that would be appropriate for an analytic history of philosophy paper, **but they all must critically and substantially engage with a primary text assigned in this course:**

- (a) Defending a philosophical analysis of a specific doctrine or argument presented in the primary text;
- (b) Defending a philosophical assessment of a specific doctrine or argument presented in the text in a way that is sensitive to the text's historical context;
- (c) Critiquing an existing interpretation of a doctrine or text;
- (d) Defending a novel or alternative interpretation of a doctrine or text against the established interpretation(s) of it.

Papers will be graded largely on the nature of their thesis (its historical and philosophical importance and interest, the clarity and precision with which it is expressed, and contribution that it makes to our continuing discussions about and understanding of the texts in question) and the adequacy of their defense of that thesis (its clarity, coherence, and plausibility, its power and fruitfulness, and the depth and relevancy of the material marshalled in its support). There is no "research" requirement for this paper, but students are encouraged to do so if they want. It is generally helpful and fruitful and there is a correlation between doing such philosophical "research" and writing stronger and better papers. Students electing to do "research" 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 caution. Students choosing to use such material rather than peer-reviewed articles and books or webposting recommended by the instructor or GTA should be prepared to justify his or her selection and use of such material within the paper's footnotes. Students are strongly encouraged to ask questions and seek help in the development of their paper projects, their thesis, and their argument. If an optional paper writing seminar is offered, students are strongly encouraged to participate.

**Quizzes, Homework, and Additional Assignments (10%)** There will be weekly quizzes self-administered via OWL or homework assigned in class or in-class assignments students are required to complete and submit for grading. The weekly quizzes will be short, timed quizzes covering material taken directly from class or the assigned reading. The quizzes will be multiple choice, true/false, fill in the blanks, short answer (max 1-2 sentences), or short essay (100-150 words). Any homework or in-class assignments will be announced in class and then posted on OWL. The OWL quiz portal will open at 6:00 pm on Thursday following a week of classes and will close in 48 hours at 6:00 pm on Saturday. Missed quizzes will not be rescheduled or available for make-up. Any accommodations or grade adjustments for missed quizzes should be

approved by the

**Attendance (10%)** 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 or GTA may strike any person's name from the attendance roll for engaging in the above, or any other such disruptive or disrespectful behavior. The instructor or GTA may also strike a person's name from the attendance roll for leaving class early without permission or an excuse. Students are awarded **2.70 points per hour** of class attended.

**Optional Book Review (Extra Credit, max +06%)** Students may write and submit a 1000 word book review for up to 06% extra credit (depending on the assessment of the review) to be added to their final course average. Reviews are due at midnight on **Wednesday March 1<sup>st</sup>**. There is no grace period for submitting the book reviews; ***no late reviews will be accepted or assessed.*** The texts that may be reviewed are available on reserve at Weldon and via OWL. They are:

- Anthony Gottlieb, *The Dream of Enlightenment: The Rise of Modern Philosophy* (New York: Liveright Publishing, 2016);
- Jacqueline Broad, *Women Philosophers of the Seventeenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002);
- Craig Martin *Subverting Aristotle: Religion, History and Philosophy in Early Modern Science* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2014).

A book review should provide its target audience with an argument for (or against) the importance of reading the book being reviewed. Reviews are always directed at a particular readership — in this case your audience should be understood to be your peers, second-year honors students enrolled in a survey of early modern Western European philosophy. Reviews should always contain a clear presentation of the message, theme, and thesis of the book, a brief depiction of its argumentative structure, and a critical assessment of the significance and value of the book for the intended audience. Even negative reviews should be able to find positive and worthwhile features of the book to mention and positively glowing reviews should be able to find shortcomings and limitations worth noting. Reviews will not be graded on whether or not you recommend that the book be read. They will be graded on your presentation of the book and the expression and justification of your judgment of the book.

**By Feb. 28, students will have available their first exegetical essay grade (15% of their total grade), their current attendance grade (approximately 5% of their total grade), and their current quiz average (approximately 5% of their total grade).**

### **Accommodations**

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, with the exception of grade adjustments for missed quizzes, 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://www.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 (Thurs)	Intellectual Crises	[AG] pp. 1-48	
<b>The Rise of Skepticism</b>			
Jan 10 (Tues)	Montaigne: <i>Sebond</i>	[AG] pp.48-121.	
Jan 12 (Thurs)	Montaigne: <i>Sebond</i>	[AG] pp.121-164.	
Jan 17 (Tues)	Bacon: <i>Idols</i> Descartes: <i>Meditations</i>	[AW] pp. 16-20. [AW] pp. 35-43.	Descartes, [AW] 25-33.
Jan 19 (Thurs)	Descartes: <i>Meditations</i>	[AW] pp. 43-47.	
Jan 24 (Tues)	Descartes: <i>Meditations</i>	[AW] pp. 47-54.	Objections and Replies, [AW] 69-92.
Jan 26 (Thurs)	Descartes: <i>Meditations</i>	[AW] pp. 61-68.	Descartes, [AW] 33-34; Spinoza, [AW] 93-99.
Jan 31 (Tues)	Elisabeth: Corr. w/ Descartes	[A] pp. 9-21.	Malebranche, [AW] 212-223.
<b>Reactions to Descartes</b>			
Feb 2 (Thurs)	Cavendish: <i>Phil Letters</i>	[A] 22-39.	Leibniz, [AW] 99-105.
Feb 7 (Tues)	Leibniz: <i>Monadology</i>	[AW] pp. 275-283.	Conway, [A] 46-76.
Feb 9 (Thurs)	Leibniz: Preface to <i>New Essays</i>	[AW] pp. 422-433.	
Feb 21 (Tues)	Reading Week No Class		Leibniz, [AW] 248-254.
Feb 23 (Thurs)	Reading Week No Class		Leibniz, [AW] 254-264.
Feb 28 (Tues)	Cudworth: Corr. w/ Leibniz	[A] pp. 77-89.	
Mar 2 (Thurs)	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 7 (Tues)	Locke: <i>Essay</i>	[AW] pp. 359-367 and 377-386.	Locke, [AW] 367-377; Trotter, [A] 126-146.
Mar 9 (Thurs)	Locke: <i>Essay</i>	[AW] pp.386-405 and 411-415.	
<b>Reactions to Locke</b>			
Mar 14 (Tues)	Berkeley: <i>Dialogues</i>	[AW] pp. 454-468.	Bayle, [AW] 512-516.
Mar 16 (Thurs)	Berkeley: <i>Dialogues</i>	[AW] pp. 468-474.	Shepherd, [A] 147-159; Berkeley, [AW] 438-446.
Mar 21 (Tues)	Berkeley: <i>Dialogues</i>	[AW] pp. 484-497.	Berkeley, [AW] 475-484.
Mar 23 (Thurs)	Hume: <i>Enquiry</i>	[AW] pp. 538-542.	
Mar 28 (Tues)	Hume: <i>Enquiry</i>	[AW] pp. 542-555.	Kant [AW] 661- 679.
Mar 30 (Thurs)	Hume: <i>Enquiry</i>	[AW] pp. 556-564.	Kant [AW] 679- 689.
Apr 4 (Tues)	Hume: <i>Enquiry</i>	[AW] pp. 577-586.	
Apr 6 (Thurs)	Reid: <i>Inquiry</i>	[AW] pp. 641-650.	