

RESPONSE-PAPER – MEDIEVAL PHILOSOPHY

DUE: FEBRUARY 27

The first part of this assignment will be familiar, since it is the same argument-reconstruction exercise that you have done for the first paper. For this assignment, you can choose any argument from any text we read between 2/4 and 2/25.

Your first task is to reconstruct the argument in the familiar way. Make sure you correctly identify the author's conclusion, as well as the necessary premises of the argument, and that your argument is valid. You should give a defense of each premise as well as you can. (And don't forget about giving references to the original text!)

In the second part of the paper, you have to respond to the argument presented in the first part. For this response, you have two options. One, you may want to say that the argument presented indeed works. If this is your position, you need to *defend* the argument from a possible objection, and give independent grounds (grounds that were not mentioned by the original author) for why the argument is sound.

If you think that the argument, even though you gave it your best shot, does *not* work, then you have to point out where you think the mistake lies. You should be thorough in this identification; it is not enough to say that the author is wrong, but you should think about *why* you disagree with them, and why they thought otherwise than you do.

Just as before, you should have a conclusion pointing out the interest and implications of your paper.

DUE: February 27th.