

PHIL 122: BRITISH EMPIRICISM

Spring Term 2015

Course Website: <http://isites.harvard.edu/k108576>

‘Tis of great use to the sailor to know the length of his line, though he cannot with it fathom all the depths of the ocean. ‘Tis well he knows that it is long enough to reach the bottom at such places as are necessary to direct his voyage, and caution him against running upon shoals that may ruin him.

John Locke, *Essay* I.i.6

INSTRUCTOR

Prof. Alison Simmons

Lecture: TTh 11:30-1 Location: Emerson 104

Tentative Office Hours: T 2-4 and by appointment

Office: 315 Emerson Hall

Email: asimmons@fas.harvard.edu

COURSE CONTENT

This course explores some of the major theoretical works of John Locke (1632-1704), George Berkeley (1685-1753), and David Hume (1711-1776). These “British Empiricists” investigate the nature and limits of human mind and then draw consequences for how we should regulate our beliefs and actions. By comparison with their neighbors, the so-called “Continental Rationalists,” the British Empiricists have a rather modest estimation of the powers of the human mind. They argue that we must derive all our ideas and knowledge from sensory experience in some way. The consequences of this innocent sounding beginning turn out to be dramatic: Locke argues that we should not think the world is naturally carved at the joints into things like ants and aardvarks; Berkeley argues that there is no mind-independent material world at all; and Hume argues that even the self is just a collection of ideas! How could such reasonable (or should we say sensible?) premises about the mind lead to such outrageous sounding conclusions about the nature of reality? Or are they not so outrageous conclusions after all?

Our methodological objective will be twofold. As a *philosophy* course, we will be finding, analyzing, and evaluating the arguments that Locke, Berkeley, and Hume offer in support of their (sometimes bizarre sounding) views. As a *history* of philosophy course, we will engage in textual interpretation to determine (as best we can) what those views and arguments are, and how the latter are supposed to provide support for the former.

COURSE GOALS

- You will learn to engage some philosophical views that may sound strange at the start. By “engage” I mean: (a) figure out what they mean (and, just as importantly, what they do *not* mean); (b) understand what the arguments are in favor of them; (c) develop *appropriate* objections to them; and (d) sort out for yourself whether the British Empiricists were onto something after all. These skills expand your intellectual imagination, root out preconceived opinions you carry with you, and sharpen your analytical skills.
- You will learn to *read* with a level of care you might not be used to but that will come to be exciting, to *write* with a level of precision you will initially find frustrating but later will find

refreshing, and to *think* with a level of clarity that will come to feel liberating. These are skills well worth developing *whatever* you go on to do after this course.

- Another important goal of the course is to learn to have a productive philosophical discussion with people who have different backgrounds, talents, and opinions from you. Philosophical discussion is a team sport. It requires showing up on time, refraining from conversation and activities that do not contribute to the team discussion, actively listening to each other, and working with each other. It doesn't work when everyone aims to be the one scoring the goal. At all times you need to figure out where the goal is and where the ball is, who is in a position to score, and how to get the ball to the person who is in the best position to score (knowing that sometimes that person is you but often it is not).

TEXTS: REQUIRED

John Locke, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, ed. P.H. Nidditch (Oxford University Press, 1975). ISBN-13: 978-0198245957.

George Berkeley, *A Treatise Concerning the Principles of Human Knowledge*, (Oxford Philosophical Texts), edited by J. Dancy (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998). ISBN-13: 978-0198751618.

George Berkeley, *Three Dialogues*, (Oxford Philosophical Texts), edited by J. Dancy (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1998). ISBN-13: 978-0198751496.

David Hume, *Treatise on Human Nature* (Oxford Philosophical Texts), edited by David Norton and Mary Norton (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000). ISBN-13: 978-0198751724.

David Hume, *Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding* (Oxford Philosophical Texts), edited by T. Beauchamp (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999). ISBN-13: 978-0198752486.

TEXTS: RECOMMENDED GUIDEBOOKS

Vere Chappell, editor. *The Cambridge Companion to Locke*. (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1994). ISBN-13: 978-0521387729.

Lex Newman, editor. *The Cambridge Companion to Locke's Essay Concerning Human Understanding* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2007). ISBN-13: 978-0521542258.

Sam Rickless, *Locke* (Malden, MA: Wiley Blackwell, 2014). ISBN-13: 978-1405189361. *A very concise overview of many major topics.*

Matthew Stuart, *Locke's Metaphysics* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013). ISBN-13: 978-0199645114. *On reserve in Robbins (too pricey to purchase). This is a slightly more advanced book but offers clear and thorough coverage of many major topics in Locke.*

Kenneth Winkler, editor. *The Cambridge Companion to Berkeley*, (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005). ISBN-13: 97809521456579.

Tom Stoneham. *Berkeley's World: An Examination of the Three Dialogues*. (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002). ISBN-13: 978-0198752370. *A survey of Berkeley's thoughts and arguments.*

Kenneth Winkler, *Berkeley: An Interpretation* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994). ISBN-13: 978-0198235095. *A more comprehensive treatment of major issues in Berkeley.*

Saul Traiger, editor. *The Blackwell Guide to Hume's Treatise* (New York: Blackwell, 2005). ISBN-13: 978-1405115094.

Elizabeth Radcliffe, editor. *The Blackwell Companion to Hume* (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2008). ISBN-13: 978-1405114554. *On reserve in Robbins (too pricey to purchase).*

Required texts and some recommended book-length commentaries are available for purchase at the Coop; they can also be purchased at places like <http://www.amazon.com> and <http://www.barnesandnoble.com/textbooks/index.asp?userid=ye7twxs9y0>; and they are on reserve in Robbins library (second floor Emerson Hall).

COURSE REQUIREMENTS AND EXPECTATIONS

READING

The amount of reading for this course is (usually) not overwhelming, but it can be difficult. ***Start early.*** You will want to read at least portions of the reading several times before you come to class so that you are prepared to engage in the discussion. The recommended *commentaries* provide a useful guide to help you sort through the issues and arguments discussed in the text. The recommended *secondary literature* enters into more sophisticated and detailed debates concerning the text, and is primarily intended as an initial place to turn if you decide to write a paper on the topic.

PARTICIPATION AND DISCUSSION

Class will be a combination of lecture and discussion. Participation in the discussion is vital to your learning. While I won't formally grade your participation, especially good participation (which does not necessarily mean that you talk a lot, but that you advance the discussion with questions, rebuttals, development of points) may result in my raising your final grade by 1/3 of a grade.

In order to insure that we are talking to each other rather than to the backs of computers, I'll ask that you keep your laptops and other electronic devices closed and put away during class. If this is a particular hardship for you, please discuss it with me. (I am mindful that there may be times when we will want to access a text or piece of information online. In those cases we'll reach for a laptop.)

SHORT PAPERS: 20% EACH

You will write one short paper (5-7 pages) for each of the philosophers we cover. I will give you topic suggestions, but you may write on a topic of your choosing so long as you clear it with me. These papers will focus on reconstructing and analyzing an argument in the text (or clarifying and settling an interpretive dispute). They are (provisionally) due on the following dates: **March 6, April 3, and May 1.**

If you need an extension, you must ask for it at least 24 hours in advance of the due date and hour. Extensions will be granted only for a good reason. Late papers without a pre-approved extension will automatically be marked down 1/3 of a grade for every 24 hours that they are late. Papers handed in more than 10 days after the due date will not be accepted.

RESPONSE PAPERS: 20% TOTAL (10 X 2% EACH)

Each week you will write a one page "response paper" on the reading for **either** the Tuesday class **or** the Thursday class. The paper is due **at the start of class and will not be accepted late.** Your task: identify a thesis, question, problem, argument, or puzzling text from the primary required reading and critically engage with it in a focused and clear way. You may, of course, address one of the "problems" I list below for each topic. These papers will serve three purposes: (a) they will give you practice in analyzing and engaging with the

text; (b) they will help prepare you for the class discussion; and (c) they may give you topic ideas for the short papers. If you do the math, you'll realize that you may opt out of one of the response papers and still get your 10 done! (I'd recommend opting out during one of the weeks when a short paper is due.) These will be graded Sat/Unsat.

FINAL EXAM: UNDERGRADUATES 20%

A final essay format exam will be given to undergraduates during Exam Week. I will give you a list of study questions and the exam will consist of a subset of those questions.

TEACHING MODULE: GRADUATE STUDENTS 20%

In lieu of the final exam, you will create a short teaching module. Throughout the semester, make note of any concepts, texts, or arguments that you find particularly difficult. One of the best ways to learn something difficult is to teach it. So, you are going to prepare to teach that concept, text, or argument in 5-10 minutes. You will do your teaching to the rest of us at the Bok Center, and it will be video-taped. You will then get feedback on your teaching from the Bok Center staff, me, and each other.

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

Discussion and the exchange of ideas are essential to doing the kind of work we are going to do in this course, and so I encourage you to talk about the course material with other students and do your own research in the library and online. On the other hand, *the work on your essays must be entirely your own*. If books, articles, websites, or discussions with other students have helped you with your paper, cite them. Plagiarism and other forms of academic dishonesty are serious offenses that undermine the trust on which the scholarly endeavor rests. They will be handled by the Ad Board.

ACCOMMODATIONS FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES

Students needing academic adjustments or accommodations because of a documented disability must present their Faculty Letter from the [Accessible Education Office](#) (AEO) and speak with the professor by the end of the second week of the term. Failure to do so may result in our inability to respond in a timely manner.

PROVISIONAL COURSE CALENDAR

Although I want everyone to focus on the primary texts, I offer recommended commentaries and secondary literature to help you all figure out (a) how philosophers engage with these historical texts and (b) what philosophical debates these texts provoke.

JAN. 27: BLIZZARD DAY, CLASS CANCELLED

JAN. 29: COURSE INTRODUCTION

FEB. 3: LOCKE'S ESSAY: OVERVIEW AND PROJECT

Problem: What is Locke out to accomplish in this enormous book?

Required: *Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, Forward (vii-xxvi), Epistle to the Reader (6-14), Table of Contents (15-41; yes, I'm serious), Book I, chapter i (43-48), and then skim I.ii-iv. NOTE the following abbreviation scheme: Book I, chapter i, section 1 is I.i.1.

Recommended commentary:

G. A. J. Rogers, "The Intellectual Setting and Aims of the *Essay*" in *The Cambridge Companion to Locke's Essay*.

Recommended Secondary Literature:

Peter Anstey, *John Locke and Natural Philosophy* OUP 2011, chapter 1.

FEB. 5: BUILDING BLOCKS OF THE MIND: SIMPLE SENSORY IDEAS, CONSCIOUSNESS AND REPRESENTATION

Problems: *What on earth is a Lockean idea?* What's its relation to perception and to consciousness? *We get our basic stock of simple ideas through sensation and reflection, Locke says. What's the difference?* **What counts as a simple idea?** How do we distinguish simple from complex ideas? *Can a simple idea become complex (as when I learn to differentiate different flavors in a sip of wine)? What on earth does Locke mean by saying our simple ideas of sensation are always real and adequate?*

Required: *Essay*, II.i-vii and II.ix-x (skipping II.viii); II.xxix-xxxii (focus on what he says about sensory ideas).

Recommended commentary:

Martha Brandt Bolton, "The Taxonomy of Ideas in Locke's *Essay*" in *The Cambridge Companion to Locke's Essay*

Vere Chappell, "Locke's theory of ideas" in *Cambridge Companion to Locke*.

Samuel Rickless, *Locke*, chapter 4.

Recommended Secondary literature on representation(alism):

Martha Bolton, "Locke on the Semantic and Epistemic Role of Simple Ideas of Sensation" *PPQ* 85: 301-321.

Recommended Secondary literature on consciousness:

Shelley Weinberg, "The Coherence of Consciousness in Locke's *Essay*" *HPQ* 25 (2008): 21-39.

Vili Lähteenmäki, "The Sphere of Experience in Locke: The Relations Between Reflection, Consciousness and Ideas," *Locke Studies* 8 (1) (2008): 59-100.

FEB. 10: ANOTHER SNOW DAY, CLASS CANCELLED

FEB. 12 & 17: MECHANISM AND THE PRIMARY-SECONDARY QUALITY DISTINCTION

Problems: *What conclusion is Locke trying to establish about the primary-secondary quality distinction in II.viii?* What does mechanism have to do with it, if anything? *How can sensory ideas of secondary qualities both (a) not resemble the secondary qualities in bodies (II.viii.15) and yet (b) be real (II.xxx.1-2) and adequate (II.xxxi) ideas of them?* What, in the end, are colors according to Locke? **BONUS:** *Are all qualities powers to produce ideas in us, as II.viii.8 suggests? If so, do corpuscles have no qualities, since they are insensible and so can't produce ideas in us? (And what are powers, anyway?)*

Required: *Essay*, II.viii, II.xxiii.9-12, II.xxi.73, II.xxx.1-2, II.xxxi.1-2, II.xxxii.1-9 & 13-16, IV.ii.11.

Recommended further Locke reading and commentary:

Essay, II.iv and xiii (on body [via solidity and space]), II.xxi.1-6 (on power)

Sam Rickless, *Locke*, chapter 6

Recommended Secondary literature:

James Hill, "Primary Qualities, Secondary Qualities and Locke's Impulse Principle" *British Journal for the History of Philosophy* 17(1) (2009): 85-98.

Matthew Stuart, "Locke's Colors." *Philosophical Review* 112 (2003): 57-96. (Also: *Locke's Metaphysics*, chapter 3)

- Samuel Rickless, "Locke on Primary and Secondary Qualities." *Pacific Philosophical Quarterly* 78 (1997): 297–319.
- Lisa Downing, "The status of mechanism in Locke's *Essay*," *Phil Review* 107 (1998): 381-414.
- Walter Ott, "What is Locke's Theory of Representation?" *BJHP* 20(6) (2012): 1077-1095.
- Michael Jacovides, "Locke's Distinction between primary and secondary qualities" in *The Cambridge Companion to Locke's "Essay Concerning Human Understanding"*, edited by Lex Newman (2007): 101-129.

FEB. 19: COMPLEX IDEAS: MIXED MODES, [RELATIONS], AND SUBSTANCES

Problem A: *When Locke says that mixed modes "have no other reality, but what they have in the Minds of Men" (II.xxx.4) and that they have "nothing to represent but themselves" (II.xxxi.3) and contrasts these with the case of substances, is he saying no such things exist? Do marriage and adultery and sexual assault not exist on Locke's view?* **Problem B:** *What do we make of this "substratum" business? Is Locke committed to it or not?* **BONUS:** *Are ideas of relations simple or complex? And what are relations? NOTE: the answer to this question matters. First of all, our ideas of substances are mostly ideas of qualities...which are powers...which involve relations. Second, personal identity is...a relation. Third, it sometimes appears that our idea of substance-in-general is itself a relational idea. Relations are everywhere! It would be bad if they turn out to be nothing. BONUS PLUS: is the self a substance or a mode?*

Required: *Essay*, I.iv.18, II.xi.9, II.xii, II.xiii.17-20, II.xxii-xxiii, II.xxx.3-5, II.xxxi.3-14, II.xxxii.10-12 & 17-26, III.iii.6, Correspondence with Stillingfleet (on website).

Recommended Commentary:

Edwin McCann, "Locke on Substance" *Cambridge Companion to Locke's Essay*.

Matthew Stuart, *Locke's Metaphysics*, chapter 1.4 and 1.5.

Walter Ott, "Archetypes without Patterns: Locke on Relations and Mixed Modes" manuscript.

Recommended Secondary Literature:

Justin Broackes, "Substance" *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 106 (2006): 133-167.

FEB. 24: LOCKE'S PHILOSOPHY OF LANGUAGE AND ABSTRACT GENERAL IDEAS

Problem A: *What is the function of language, on Locke's view? What, precisely, is the relationship between words, ideas and things on Locke's view? Ott gives a reading of Locke that is wildly different from that of Kretzmann and Ashworth, and that brings out the difference between Locke and most current philosophical theories of language. Who gets it right?* **Problem B:** *What is an abstract general idea and how is it formed?*

Required: *Essay*, III.i-v, III.ix-x, and then II.xi.1-11, IV.vii.9.

Recommended Commentary:

Michael Losonsky, "Language, Meaning, and Mind in Locke's *Essay*" in *The Cambridge Companion to Locke's Essay*.

Sam Rickless, *Locke*, ch. 4.4.

Recommended Secondary Literature:

Walter Ott, *Locke's Philosophy of Language*, chapter 1.

Norman Kretzmann, "The Main Thesis of Locke's Semantic Theory" *Philosophical Review* 77 (1968): 175-196.

E.J. Ashworth, "Do Words Signify Ideas or Things: The Scholastic Sources of Locke's Theory of Language" *Journal of the History of Philosophy* 19 (1981): 299-326.

FEB. 26 & MAR. 3: NOMINAL AND REAL ESSENCE: ARE THERE NATURAL KINDS?

Problem: On the one hand, it looks like the division of the world into kumquats and pomegranates and mangoes is the “workmanship of the understanding” so that there are no “natural joints” out there sorting things into natural kinds. On the other hand, Locke seems to think that unlike the case of mixed modes, our ideas of substances have “archetypes” outside the mind; that by contrast with the case of mixed modes, our ideas of substances are apt to be inadequate and false; that unlike the case of mixed modes, the nominal and real essences of substances are not identical; and that scientific research can improve our ideas of substances. **Can these two claims be reconciled?** On the way to reconciling them (if we can), we’ll need to figure out what nominal and real essences are, and what the relationship between them is supposed to be. We also want to know what fatal mistakes we are supposed to be making when we try to use general terms to refer directly to things in the world.

Required: Essay, II.xxx-xxxii (review), III.iii (review), III.vi, III.ix-x (review), IV.iv.11-14, IV.vi.4-6.

Recommended Intro Commentary:

Margaret Atherton, “Locke on Essences and Classification” in *The Cambridge Companion to Locke’s Essay*.

Recommended Secondary Literature:

Paul Guyer, “Locke’s philosophy of language” in *Cambridge Companion to Locke*.

Kyle Stanford, “Reference and natural kind terms: The real essence of Locke’s view,” *PPQ* 79(1) (1998): 78-97.

David Owen, “Locke on Real Essences,” *History of Philosophy Quarterly* 8 (2) (1991): 105 - 118.

Matthew Stuart, *Locke’s Metaphysics*, chapter 4.

MARCH 5: LOCKE ON THE LIMITS OF KNOWLEDGE AND SENSITIVE KNOWLEDGE

Problem A: *Why will physics never be a science? What does that mean? What would it have to be like to be a science? Why can’t we achieve that? And how, then, are we supposed to proceed in physics?* **Problem B:** *why on earth does “sensitive” knowledge get to be called knowledge at all? Can he be serious? Is he just a doofus when it comes to skepticism? Is Locke an empiricist about knowledge after all? (If so, does this change how things look for physics?)*

Required: Essay, IV.i-iii, IV.vi.4-15, IV.xii.7-10.

Recommended Commentary:

Anotonia Lolordo, “Locke on Knowledge and Belief” in *The Blackwell Companion to Locke*, edited by Matthew Stuart, forthcoming. (Manuscript on website)

Lex Newman, “Locke on Knowledge,” in *The Cambridge Companion to Locke’s Essay*.

Recommended Secondary Literature on the *limits* of knowledge of bodies:

Edwin McCann, “Lockean mechanism” in *Locke*, ed. Chappell (OUP).

Margaret Wilson, “Superadded properties: The limits of mechanism in Locke,” *American Philosophical Quarterly* 16 (1979).

Peter Anstey, *John Locke and Natural Philosophy*, OUP 2011, chapters 2 & 7.

Recommended Secondary Literature on *sensitive knowledge*:

Jennifer Marusic, “Sensory Knowledge” manuscript.

*******FIRST PAPER DUE FRIDAY, MARCH 6, 5 P.M.*******

MARCH 10: BERKELEY’S NEW THEORY OF VISION

Problem A: *How do we perceive distance through sight? Why is this a problem in the first place? Do we in any real sense perceive distance through sight according to Berkeley? How do we perceive it? If we had no sense of touch, what does Berkeley imagine our visual experience would be like (2-dimensional? Interior like pains? Stable or unstable?)* **BONUS:** *what’s the alternative (Cartesian) account of perceiving distance through sight?* **Problem B:** *How do we perceive orientation/situation by sight? The retinal image is upside-down.*

How do we come to see things rightside-up? Are “up” and “down” even visual qualities? **Problem C: What is the heterogeneity thesis?** What’s the position and argument that the objects of vision and touch are heterogeneous?

Required: *New Theory of Vision*. Available on website.

Recommended Commentary:

Margaret Atherton, “Berkeley’s theory of vision and its reception” *Cambridge Companion to Berkeley*, ch. 4.

Recommended Secondary Literature:

Margaret Atherton, *Berkeley’s Revolution in Vision* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990).

Richard Brook, “Berkeley’s Theory of Vision: Transparency and Signification” *BJHP* 11(4) (2003): 691-699.

Becco Copenhaver, “Berkeley on the Language of Nature and the Objects of Vision” *Res Philosophica* 91(1) (2014): 29-46.

Rick Grush, “Berkeley and the Spatiality of Vision” *JHP* 45(3) (2007): 413-442.

Samuel Rickless, *Berkeley’s Argument for Idealism*, chs. 1-2.

MARCH 12: BERKELEY ON OFFENSE: THE CASE AGAINST MATTER

Problem A: What’s Berkeley’s attack on abstract ideas? What’s wrong with of abstract ideas? What is the sort of abstraction that he’s opposed to? What trouble does it lead to? **Problem B: What’s the distinction between immediate and mediate perception?** How does it figure in the case against matter?

Required: *Principles*, Introduction, Part I §§8-24; *First and Second Dialogues*.

Recommended Commentary:

Robert Fogelin, *Berkeley and the Principles of Human Knowledge*, ch. 4.

A.C. Grayling, “Berkeley’s Argument for Immaterialism” *Cambridge Companion to Berkeley*, ch. 6.

Samuel Rickless, *Berkeley’s Argument for Idealism*, chs. 3-4.

Tom Stoneham, *Berkeley’s World*, chapters 3 & 4.

Kenneth Winkler, *Berkeley: An Interpretation*, chapters 1 & 6.

Recommended Secondary Literature:

George Pappas, *Berkeley’s World* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2000), chapters 2-3 on abstraction.

MARCH 17 & 19: SPRING BREAK!!!

MARCH 24: BERKELEY ON OFFENSE: THE CASE AGAINST MATTER CONT.

See March 12 for readings, issues.

MARCH 26 & 31: BERKELEY ON DEFENSE: THE CASE FOR IDEALISM

Problem A: Berkeley insists on a new dualism, one between spirits and ideas. What’s the different and relation between the two? **Problem B: What are kumquats, on Berkeley’s view?** Are they perceivable by more than one person? What are their identity conditions? **C: What role does God play in Berkeley’s idealism?** God seems to be required for objects to persist when we don’t perceive them. What’s the relation between God’s ideas and our ideas? **Problem D: Berkeley insists that his aim is to combat skepticism and defend common sense.** One might naturally think that idealism both invites skepticism and flies in the face of common sense! Defend Berkeley’s claim. **Bonus: What become of corpuscles in Berkeley’s world?**

Required: *Principles* Part I §§1-7, 25-57, 86-91; *Third Dialogue*.

Recommended Commentary:

Robert Fogelin, *Berkeley and the Principles of Human Knowledge*, chs. 3, 5-6, 10.

Tom Stoneham, *Berkeley’s World*, ch. 5 & 8.

Kenneth Winkler, *Berkeley: An Interpretation*, chapter 7.

Recommended Secondary Literature:

- Donald Baxter, "Berkeley, Perception and Identity" *PPR* 51(1) (1991): 85-98.
S. Seth Bordner, "Berkeley's 'Defense' of 'Commonsense'" *JHP* 49(3) (2011): 315-338
Melissa Frankel, "Berkeley and God in the Quad" *Phil Compass* 7/6 (2012): 388-396.
Margaret Atherton, "The Books are in the Study as Before?: Berkeley's Claims about Real Physical Objects" *BJHP* 16(1) (2008): 85-100.

APRIL 2: CATCH UP OR PAPER WORKSHOP

*******SECOND PAPER DUE FRIDAY APRIL 3, 5 P.M.*******

APRIL 7: HUME'S PROJECT: NEWTON OF THE MIND

Problem A: *What is Hume aiming to do in these texts? What is the project?* **Problem B:** *Hume limits his theory to perceptions and relations among them. What's his taxonomy of perceptions? What kinds of relations hold among them? What's the distinction between impressions and ideas? Between simple and complex? What's the problem about abstract ideas and what's Hume's solution? What's the distinction between natural and philosophical relations?* **Problem C:** *What's the deal with the globe of white marble? Are our ideas of the shape and color of it different and separable? Does what he says about it on p. 25 conflict with what he says about simple ideas on p. 2?*

Required: *Treatise* Introduction, I.i, I.iii.5&7; *Enquiry* §§1-3.

Recommended Commentary:

- Janet Broughton, "Impressions and Ideas" in *The Blackwell Guide to Hume's Treatise*.
Don Garrett, "Hume's Theory of Ideas" in *The Blackwell Companion to Hume*.
James Harris, "Editing Hume's *Treatise*" *Modern Intellectual History* 5(3) (2008): 633-641.
Saul Traiger, "Hume on Memory and Imagination" in *The Blackwell Companion to Hume*.

Recommended Secondary Literature:

- Janet Broughton, "What Does the Scientist of Man Observe?" *Hume Studies* 18(2) (1992): 155-168.
R.J. Butler, "Hume's Impressions" *Royal Institute of Philosophy Lectures* 9 (1974-75): 122-136.

APRIL 9 & 14: CAUSAL REASONING & BELIEF

Problem A: *The position and argument: see the Roadmap. Includes: What's the distinction between knowledge and probability? (And between philosophical and unphilosophical probability?) Why does Hume take the topic of causation to be so important? Why does he decide to "beat around neighboring fields" and what are those fields? Map the argument at 1.3.6.* **Problem B:** *What's the upshot with regard to our beliefs about unobserved matters of fact? Should we stop making them? How are we to regulate them?*

Required: *Treatise* I.iii.1-13 and 15-16; *Enquiry* §§4-5 & 9-10.

Recommended Commentary:

- William Edward Morris, "Belief, Probability, Normativity" in *The Blackwell Guide to Hume's Treatise*.
Louis Loeb, "Inductive Inference in Hume's Philosophy" in *The Blackwell Companion to Hume*.

Recommended Secondary Literature:

- Janet Broughton, "Hume's Explanation of Causal Inference" in *Contemporary Perspectives on Early Modern Philosophy*, edited by Paul Hoffman, David Owen, & Gideon Yaffe (Buffalo: Broadview, 2008): 289-306.

David Owen, "Hume and the Lockean Background: Induction and the Uniformity Principle" *Hume Studies* 18(2) (1992): 199-208.

APRIL 16 & 21: THE IDEA OF NECESSARY CONNECTION (OR CAUSATION)

Problem A: *What, in the end, is Hume's position on causation?* Is he a skeptical realist? A deflationary realist? Or an anti-realist/projectivist? Which is the real view and which view ought he endorse?

Problem B: *Why does Hume represent his position on causation as a most "violent paradox"?*

Required: *Treatise* I.iii.2, 14; *Enquiry* §§7-8

Recommended Commentary:

Abraham Roth, "Causation" David Owen, in *The Blackwell Guide to Hume's Treatise*.

Recommended Secondary Literature:

Don Garrett, "Hume's Theory of Causation" in *Oxford Handbook to Causation*, edited by Helen Beebe (New York: Oxford University Press, 2009).

Kenneth Winkler, "The New Hume," *Philosophical Review* 100 (1991): 541-579.

Peter Millican, "Hume, Causal Realism, and Causal Science," *Mind* 118 (2009): 647-712.

APRIL 23: EXTERNAL WORLD

Problem A: *Chart the argument that aims to reconstruct the psychogenesis of our belief in an external world. Why does he need to reconstruct it in the first place?* **Problem B:** *What, in the end, is Hume's attitude toward external world skepticism?*

Required: *Treatise* I.iv.2, I.ii.6.

Recommended Commentary:

Donald Baxter, "Identity, Continued Existence, and the External World" in *The Blackwell Guide to Hume's Treatise*.

Recommended Secondary Literature:

Yumiko Inukai, "Perceptions and Objects: Hume's Radical Empiricism," *Hume Studies* 37 (2011): 189-210.

Kenneth Winkler, "Hume on Skepticism with Regard to Senses" forthcoming in *The Cambridge Companion to Hume's Treatise*.

APRIL 28: SELF & PERSONAL IDENTITY

Problem A: *What is Hume's account of our belief in a self?* **Problem B:** *What's up with the "second thoughts" in the Appendix?*

Required: *Treatise* I.iv.5-6 and Appendix, pp. 633-36.

Recommended Commentary:

Donald Ainslie, "Hume on Personal Identity" in *The Blackwell Companion to Hume*.

Recommended Secondary Literature:

Donald Ainslie, "Hume's Reflections on the Identity and Simplicity of Mind," *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 62 (2001): 557-578.

Don Garrett, "Rethinking Hume's Second Thoughts about Personal Identity" in *The Possibility of Philosophical Understanding: Essays for Barry Stroud* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011): 15-42.

APRIL 30: SKEPTICISM AND NATURALISM

Problem: *So is Hume a skeptic in the end?* Does the naturalism replace normativity? Ground normativity? And should we ban philosophy classes from the university?

Required: *Treatise* I.iv.1 & 7; *Enquiry* §7.

Recommended Commentary:

Don Garrett, "Hume's Conclusions in "Conclusion of this Book" in *The Blackwell Guide to Hume's Treatise*.

Janet Broughton, "Hume's Naturalism and His Skepticism" in *The Blackwell Companion to Hume*.

Recommended Secondary Literature:

Donald Ainslie, *Hume's True Skepticism*, ch. 7.

Annet Baier, *A Progress of Sentiments*, ch. 1.

Janet Broughton, "Hume's Naturalism about Cognitive Norms" *Philosophical Topics* 31 (2003): 1-19.

Janet Broughton, "The Inquiry in Hume's *Treatise*" *Phil Review* 113(4) (2004): 537-556.

Kemp Smith, "The Naturalism of Hume" *Mind* 14(2) (1905): 149-173.

Don Garrett, "Hume's Conclusions in "Conclusion of this Book" in *The Blackwell Guide to Hume's Treatise*.

Sean Greenberg, *Philosophy Compass* 3(4) (2008): 721-733.

******* THIRD PAPER DUE FRIDAY MAY 1, 5 P.M.*******