Honours Course Selection

Philosophy Academic Year 2019-20

Honours Philosophy:

At the honours level, philosophy students take 120 credits each year. Philosophy courses are 20 credits each. Except for a 0-credit *Philosophy Dissertation Preparation Course*, Philosophy does not have any required courses in its degree plan so for the philosophy component of their degree, students have a wide range of choices.

Compared to pre-honours, the courses will be smaller, will cover topics in greater depth, and will be more challenging. Philosophy uses a variety of assessment methods, including: essays, exams, projects, and short assignments.

Single honours:
In their third year, single honours philosophy students normally take six philosophy honours courses of 20 credits each. All third year students are automatically enrolled in the 0 credit philosophy dissertation preparation course. In their fourth year, single honours students take four philosophy courses of 20 credits each. Single honours philosophy students earn their remaining 40 credits in fourth year by writing an independent or coursework dissertation in philosophy.

Joint honours:
Individual degree programmes vary so check with your personal tutor about the details of your degree programme. All third year students are automatically enrolled in the 0 credit philosophy dissertation preparation course. With exceptions: in their third year joint honours students take around half their credits in philosophy. In their fourth year, joint honours philosophy students typically take 40 credits in philosophy and 40 credits in their other subject. They earn their remaining 40 credits in fourth year by writing an independent or coursework dissertation in philosophy or a dissertation in their other subject.

The Honours Years are divided into Year 3 courses and Year 4 courses. Students must select courses appropriate to their year.

Year 3 Courses	Year 4 Courses
More general topics. More contact time. Similar courses offered yearly.	More specialized topics. Smaller class size. Suitable for a philosophy coursework dissertation. More course variability.

Distribution: Courses at **year three** are divided into four areas. Students pursuing a *single honours philosophy degree* must take *at least one course* in each of the four areas. Students pursuing a *joint honours degree* may take *no more than two courses* in any one area. This requirement applies to all degrees except: *Cognitive Science*, *Philosophy and Theology*, and the various *DELC and Philosophy degrees*. Courses at **year four** have no distribution requirement.

Course Selection: The department will shortly distribute a link to the online course selection portal. This will require you to rank preferred philosophy courses each semester of the 2019-20 academic year. We will make our best efforts to ensure that all students enrol in some of their top choices although we cannot guarantee they will be able to take all of their first choices. **As a result, courses are not allocated on a first-come first serve basis.** The course selection will be due on **June 23rd 2019 at 11pm.** Preferences received after that date will not be given as high a priority.

Courses: Below we list the year 3 and year 4 courses we anticipate offering next year. Please note that because we are currently hiring, we cannot guarantee that all of them will run at year 4. In some cases, the details will need to be filled in. These courses are marked with a * in the list. We will make every effort to ensure this information is complete before the deadline for selecting courses and we will make periodic announcement about updates. We will fill in the details for. Ranking a course that does not run will not disadvantage a student in enrolling in their other preferences. Relatedly, in some cases the course information is schematic. This document will be updated when more detailed information becomes available.

Year 3 Courses

Semester 1

1. Logic 2: Modal Logics
2. Metaphysics
3. Topics in Mind and Cognition
4. Feminism*
5. Aesthetics
6. Late Modern Philosophy*
7. Early Modern Philosophy*
8. Philosophy of Language

Semester 2

1. Applied Ethics
2. Themes in Epistemology*
3. Philosophy of Religion
4. Ancient Philosophy*
5. Philosophy of Science
6. Ethics
7. Political Philosophy

Area 1: Knowledge and Reality

Themes in Epistemology (Semester 2)

Lecturer: TBA

Description: Course details will be supplied as soon as a lecturer is appointed. We will email an announcement.

Assessment	Suggested Reading
40% midterm essay (1500 words) 60% final essay (2500 words)	https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/epistemology/

Metaphysics (Semester 1)

Lecturer: Dr Alasdair Richmond

Description: In keeping with the course remit of offering a detailed introduction to one perennially interesting, central, topic in metaphysics, this year Metaphysics (PHIL10155) will consist of detailed seminars and accompanying tutorials on key philosophical issues in the philosophy of time. Coverage is largely with an analytical slant but including some classic historical issues too. Students should end this course conversant with a range of significant metaphysical (and other) issues surrounding time. No detailed logical, scientific or metaphysical expertise will be assumed, and the course is intended to be accessible to students with a wide range of philosophical interests and aptitudes.

Assessment	Suggested Reading
40% midterm essay (1500 words) 60% final essay (2500 words)	https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/time/ Philip Turetzky, Time, London, Routledge, 1998, Ch. 1-3; J. M. E. McTaggart, 'The Unreality of Time', Mind, 17, 1908: 457-74, Craig Bourne, 'When Am I?: A Tense Time for Some Tense Theorists?' Australasian Journal of Philosophy, 80, 2002: 359-71.

Philosophy of Religion (Semester 2)

Lecturer: Dr Patrick Todd

Description: This course primarily investigates the concept of God centrally at issue in Western religion: the concept of the greatest possible (or "perfect") being. First: what would such a being be like, were that being to exist? Omnipotent? Omniscient? Wholly Good? But are these attributes internally consistent? And are they consistent with one another? Second: is there any good philosophical argument for the existence of such a being? Here we investigate ontological, cosmological, and moral arguments for the existence of God. Third: does the believer in God need a philosophical argument for that belief, if that belief is to be rationally justified? Fourth: are there good arguments against the existence of God, thus conceived? Here we consider the traditional problem of evil: does the evil that we encounter in this world constitute good reason to think that God does not exist?

Assessment	Suggested Reading
40% midterm essay (1500 words) 60% final essay (2500 words)	https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/philosophy-religion/ "Divine Omniscience and Voluntary Action," Nelson Pike. "The Modal Ontological Argument," Robert Kane. "The Cosmological Argument," William Rowe. "Is Belief in God Properly Basic?" Alvin Plantinga. "Eternity," Eleonore Stump. "Horrendous Evils and the Goodness of God," Marilyn Adams

Area 2: Language, Cognition, and Science

Philosophy of Language (Semester 1)
Lecturer: Dr Katie Monk
Description: This course will explore current and historical debates in the philosophy of language. We will think about questions like: How do names refer? How do metaphors function? What is the semantic content of a name? What is a slur?

Assessment	Suggested Reading
Midterm Essay 40% Final Essay 60%	Sample readings: Gottleb Frege, Sense and Refence David Lewis, Attitudes De Dicto and De Se

Logic 2: Modal Logics (Semester 1)
Lecturer: Dr Wolfgang Schwarz
Description: This course is a sequel to Logic 1, covering modal extensions of classical propositional and first-order logic, as well as some basic themes in metalogic. Modal logic is traditionally characterized as the logic of necessity and possibility, but we will also apply it to the study of knowledge, belief, obligation, permission, time, and other areas. In many of these applications, the relevant phenomena are usefully modelled in terms of "possible worlds" with certain relations among them. We will explore these so-called "Kripke models" in some detail, and investigate connections between different kinds of proof systems and Kripke models. No background knowledge apart from Logic 1 is assumed.

Assessment	Suggested Reading
Final Exam 50%, Two take-home tests counting 20% and 30%. Note: this is a formal course.	Rod Girle's book "Modal Logics and Philosophy" is a very gentle introduction to the topic. The Stanford Encyclopedia entry https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/logic modal/ can also give you a good idea of the topic, although it is a little brisk as an introduction.

Honours Philosophy of Science (Semester 2)

Lecturer: Dr Jo Wolff

Description: The course is a continuation of the pre-Hon. Philosophy of Science 1, although the latter is not a pre-requisite for it. This year's course will focus on topics in the metaphysics of science. Specifically, we will be looking at laws of nature, quantities, and natural kinds. Questions discussed in this course include: Do laws of nature govern? Could the laws of nature be different in other possible worlds? What sorts of attributes are quantities? Can we measure properties like spiciness and colour, or just attributes like mass and length? What are natural kinds? Are biological species natural kinds?

Readings will be a mix of mostly contemporary philosophy of science and metaphysics, with a few classic readings. Examples from the sciences will be used, but no background in a scientific field is assumed.

Assessment	Suggested Reading
Midterm Essay (1500 words, 40%) Final Essay (2500 words, 60%)	David Armstrong, What is a law of nature? Cambridge University Press (1983) Helen Beebee, 'The Non-Governing Conception of Laws of Nature' Philosophy and Phenomenological Research Vol. 61, No. 3 (Nov., 2000), pp. 571-594 Dupré, John. 1981. Natural kinds and biological taxa. The Philosophical Review 90 (1): 66-90 M. Eddon Quantitative Properties Philosophy Compass 8 (7):633-645 (2013) Katherine Hawley & Alexander Bird What are natural kinds? Philosophical Perspectives 25 (1):205-221 (2011) Mundy, Brent. 1987. The metaphysics of quantity. Philosophical Studies 51 (1): 29-54

Topics in Mind and Cognition (Semester 1)

Lecturer: Dr Suilin Lavelle

Description: Do I need language to think? What is consciousness, and how does it relate to non-conscious processes? Is thought unique to humans? How should evolutionary considerations affect philosophy of mind? These are some of the questions examined in this course. We will study seminal papers by leading philosophers in the field, including (among others) Kathleen Akins, Louise Antony, Lynne Rudder-Baker, Ned Block, Andy Clark, Jerry Fodor and Ruth Millikan.

Topics in Mind and Cognition builds on the foundations set in *Mind, Matter and Language* while offering the opportunity to think further about some of the topics covered in that course. At the same time, we will be covering material that will be referenced in some fourth year courses (e.g. philosophy of information, philosophy of psychology, social cognition).

Assessment	Suggested Reading
Mid-term essay (1500 words, 35%) Final essay (2000 words, 65%.	Akins, K. (1996). Of Sensory Systems and the aboutness of mental states. The Journal of Philosophy, 93(7), 337-372. Antony, L. (2007). Everybody has got it: a defence of non-reductive materialism. In B. McLaughlin, & J. Cohen (Eds.), Contemporary Debates in the Philosophy of Mind (pp. 143 - 159). Blackwell. Carruthers, P. (2004). On being simple minded. American Philosophical Quarterly, 41, 205-220. Clark, A. (2011). Supersizing the Mind. O.U.P. Crane, T. (2001). Elements of Mind. O.U.P Neander, K. (2007). Teleological Theories of Mental Content: Can Darwin Solve the Problem of Intentionality? In Michael Ruse (ed.), The Oxford Handbook of Philosophy of Biology. Oxford University Press

Area 3: Morality and Value

Note: because both courses focus on topics in political philosophy, we may not be able to prioritize students who want to take courses in *both* Feminism *and* Political Philosophy.

Ethics (Semester 2)

Lecturer: Dr Guy Fletcher

Description: On this course we will examine two major species of normative ethical theory: Consequentialism and Contractualism. In part I we examine Consequentialism (and Utilitarianism). Our two main lines of inquiry will be (a) which form of consequentialism is best? and (b) is even the best form of consequentialism *good enough*? We close part I by looking at Consequentialism and aggregation.

In part II we turn to Contractualism, specifically the form defended by T. M. Scanlon in his groundbreaking *What We Owe to Each Other*. We will seek to understand the view in its own terms, assess the extent to which it improves upon Consequentialism, and consider what objections it faces. We close part II by looking specifically at Contractualism and Aggregation and Contractualist answers to the Non-Identity Problem before, at the very end, thinking about the ethics of human extinction. *Note*: The material in part II will be *substantially* more difficult than the material in part I.

Assessment	Suggested Reading
Midterm essay (1500 words, 30%) Final essay (2000 words, 70%)	Students considering taking this course should therefore read the introduction to *What we Owe to Each Other*, available online here, to familiarise themselves: https://nyti.ms/2DXVy0m

Feminism (Semester 1)

Lecturer: TBA

Description: In this course we will examine philosophical approaches to feminism and feminist issues, focussing on the philosophical and conceptual tools needed to understand and analyse structural inequalities. We will study definitions of oppression, gender, and intersectionality. Topics covered may include abortion, affirmative action, family structures; global feminism; issues around sex and sexuality, including the objectification of the female body, masculinity and femininity, pornography; prostitution.

Assessment	Suggested Reading
Participation (5%) Mid-Term Essay (1500 words, 40%) Final Essay (2500 words, 55%)	Mason, Elinor, 'Feminist Philosophy', Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy online. https://www.rep.routledge.com/articles/thematic/feminist-philosophy/v-1 https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/feminism-political/

Aesthetics (Semester 1)

Lecturer: Dr Andrew Mason

Description: The course will examine theories of beauty, the arts and the aesthetic in contemporary thinkers, while also considering historical treatments of these topics. Topics discussed will include aesthetic experience, beauty, art, the aesthetics of nature, literary interpretation, forgery, morality and emotion.

Assessment	Suggested Reading
Mid-Term Essay (1500 words, 40%) End of semester Take-Home Test (60%)	Introductory works. C. Lyas, Aesthetics. A. Shephard, Aesthetics. G. Graham, Philosophy of the Arts: an Introduction to Aesthetics. Collections. D. Cooper, Classic Readings in Aesthetics. G. Dickie and R. Sclafani, Aesthetics: a Critical Anthology. (Second edition by Dickie, Sclafani and Roblin.) P. Lamarque and S. Olsen, Aesthetics and the Philosophy of Art. A. Neill and A. Ridley, Arguing about Art . P. Kivy, The Blackwell Guide to Aesthetics. P. Alperson, The Philosophy of the Visual Arts. O. Hanfling, Philosophical Aesthetics; an Introduction. S. Feagin and P. Maynard, Aesthetics. J. Levinson, Oxford Handbook of Aesthetics. Reference work. D. Cooper, ed., A Companion to Aesthetics.

Political Philosophy (Semester 2)
Lecturer: Dr Felipa Melo Lopes

Description: This course introduces students to the liberal tradition in Western Political Philosophy. We will trace the historical roots of contemporary social contract theory and pay special attention to recent critiques. Some of the questions we will be interested include: What makes a state legitimate? What is justice? What is the relation between liberty and equality? And how can we ask these questions in patriarchal and racist social contexts? We will start the course by following the development of key ideas in 17th and 18th century Europe, through the work of authors such as Hobbes, Rousseau and Kant. We will then focus on 20th century North American liberalism as articulated by John Rawls. We will explore Rawls' influential work and equally influential critiques from libertarian, communitarian, feminist, multiculturalist and anti-racist perspectives.

Assessment	Suggested Reading
Midterm Essay (1500 words, 40%) Final Essay (2500 Words, 60%)	Thomas Hobbes Leviathan (1651) Jeremy Waldron Homelessness and the Issue of Freedom (1991) Elizabeth Anderson What is the Point of Equality? (1989)

Applied Ethics (Semester 2)

Lecturer: Dr Debbie Roberts

Description: The primary focus this year will be topics in the ethics of technology. There is no doubt that technology it increases our capabilities and makes life easier in a myriad of ways, which seems desirable. Viewed instrumentally, on the face of it, technology is generally a good thing. However, it also raises many difficult and pressing ethical issues.

In this course we will focus on particular ethical issues raised by technology with regard to: *big data, social media, human enhancement, eugenics* and *geoengineering*. First we will the ethical implications of big data and social media taking into account values including privacy, consent, autonomy and well-being. In the sections on human enhancement and eugenics we consider questions such as the legitimate limits of health care, and if and when genetic enhancement is ever permissible or even obligatory. The final section of the course concerns technology and its application, via geoengineering, to the pressing problem of climate change.

Assessment	Suggested Reading

Midterm Essay 40% Final Essay 60%	David Chalmers on the Singularity (podcast) https://philosophybites.com/2010/05/david-chalmers-on-the-singularity.html The online Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy https://plato.stanford.edu contains entries covering these topics, and makes for very useful background reading. I recommend the following: 'Philosophy and Technology', 'Privacy and Information Technology' , 'Social Networking and Ethics', 'Human Enhancement', 'Eugenics'. The Whitehouse 2016 report on Big Data: https://obamawhitehouse.archives.gov/sites/default/files/microsites/ostp/2016_0504_data_discrimination.pdf Alberto Giuibilini and Sagar Sanyal 'The Ethics of Human Enhancement *Philosophy Compass* 10 (4):233-243 (2015) Tim Hayward 'Climate Change and Ethics' *Nature Climate Change 2* 843–848 (2012)

Area 4: History of Philosophy

Ancient Philosophy (Semester 2)

Lecturer: Dr Damian Caluori

Description: In this course, we will discuss the beginnings of ethics in the Western tradition: Presocratics, Plato, Aristotle and the Hellenistic Stoics, Epicureans, and Sceptics. We will ask (and try to answer!) questions such as the following: was Socrates the first ethicist, and if so, what distinguishes him from the Presocratics? What is Socratic ethics? What role do Platonic Forms play in a good Platonic life? What is human nature according to Aristotle, and what does this mean for ethics? Is a good life a life of Epicurean pleasures, or is it a virtuous life? What role do emotions play in a good life? Ought we to worry about death or is it nothing to us? And finally: is it possible at all to answer any of these questions? The sceptics had their doubts. They even doubted that we can have reasons for preferring one way of life to another. This leads to the question of whether the sceptics can live their scepticism.

Primary Readings

S. M. Cohen, P. Curd, C.D.C. Reeve (eds.), *Readings in Ancient Greek Philosophy*, 5th edition (2016).

A. A. Long & D. Sedley (eds.), *The Hellenistic Philosophers.* Vol. 1 (1987).

Ancient Philosophy

J. Annas, *Ancient Philosophy. A Very Short Introduction* (2000).

J. Barnes, *A Very Short Introduction to Aristotle* (2000).

J. Lear, *Aristotle: the Desire to Understand* (1988).

A. A. Long, *Hellenistic Philosophy: Stoics, Epicureans, Sceptics* (1986).

C. Meinwald, *Plato* (2016).

Ancient Ethics

T. Irwin, *The Development of Ethics*, vol. I (2007).

B. Reis (ed.), *The Virtuous Life in Greek Ethics* (2006).

S. Suave Meyer, *Ancient Ethics* (2008).

Podcast

https://historyofphilosophy.net/classical

Assessment	Suggested Reading
Midterm Essay (1500 words, 40%) Final Essay (2500 Words, 60%)	

Early Modern Philosophy (Semester 1)

Lecturer: TBA

Description: This course will introduce students to the philosophy of David Hume (1711–76), an alumnus of the University of Edinburgh and a major figure of the Scottish Enlightenment. In his lifetime, Hume was notorious for his scepticism and irreligion. Today, he is lauded for pioneering an empirical, naturalistic approach to the study of human mental and social life—a forerunner of present-day cognitive and social sciences. His work still exerts a major influence on many areas of philosophy, including epistemology, metaphysics, philosophy of mind and action, ethics, aesthetics, and philosophy of religion.

We will focus on Hume's epistemology and ethics, and on his philosophy of religion, where he applies his epistemological and ethical views to questions about the existence and moral character of God. The questions we will address include: Are any of our beliefs based on good reasons? Are human actions causally necessitated by past states of the universe, and, if so, are any of our actions truly free? Is it rational for us to believe that miracles have occurred? Is moral cognition based on reason or feeling, or on a combination of the two? What is the relationship between morality and self-interest? Is it rational to believe in God? If so, is it rational to believe that God is morally good?

Assessment	Suggested Reading
Midterm Essay (1500 words, 40%) Final Essay (2500 Words, 60%)	The best introduction to Hume is Hume himself. To prepare for this course, I therefore recommend reading: • *An Enquiry concerning Human Understanding* (especially §§4, 5, 10, 11 and 12) • *An Enquiry concerning the Principles of Morals* (especially §§1 and 9 and Appendices 1 and 2, and the appended short work entitled "A Dialogue") • *Dialogues concerning Natural Religion* (especially Parts 1, 2, 10, 11, and 12). Excellent editions of these and other of Hume's works are freely available at <www.davidhume.org>. (Please note that the versions available on <www.earlymoderntexts.com> are modern-English "translations" of Hume's works. You may find that they help you to understand Hume's eighteenth-century language, but you should not use them as a substitute for reading Hume's own words.) For introductions to Hume's life and work by present-day scholars, I recommend: • Blackburn, Simon. *How to Read Hume.* (London: Granta, 2008) • Cohon, Rachel, "Hume's Moral Philosophy", The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Fall 2018 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2018/entries/hume-moral/>. • Garrett, Don. *Hume.* (Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge, 2015); see also the accompanying video at <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hw1Z9yOSnk8> • Millican, Peter. Introduction. In D. Hume, An Enquiry concerning Human Understanding (Oxford World's Classics edition), edited by P. Millican, pp.ix–lx. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007). Available online: <https://davidhume.org/scholarship/papers/millican/2007%20Introduction.pdf> • Millican, Peter. "The Significance of David Hume" (Philosophy Bites interview).

	Available online: <https://nigelwarburton.typepad.com/philosophy_bites/2008/04/peter-millican.html> • Morris, William Edward, and Brown, Charlotte R., "David Hume", The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy (Summer 2019 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), forthcoming URL = <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2019/entries/hume/>. A valuable collection of articles on various aspects of Hume's thought is: • Radcliffe, Elizabeth S. *A Companion to Hume.* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2008)

Late Modern Philosophy (Semester 1)

Lecturer: Dr Jason Carter

Description: This course will focus on the roots of existentialist philosophy as it appears in the works of Søren Kierkegaard, Friedrich Nietzsche, and Martin Heidegger. These thinkers share a striking rejection of traditional 'objective' philosophical accounts of knowledge and the self, epitomised in Hegel's system of absolute idealism. Instead, they insist that individual experiences are more important than universal forms of rationality, and that human 'selfhood' is not something given, but something to be achieved or chosen. By reading through selections from these thinkers' primary works, we will explore their different accounts of (1) the nature of truth, (2) the self, (3) the relation between freedom and anxiety, and (4) authenticity.

Assessment	Suggested Reading
Short essay 1 (750 words): 20% Short essay 2 (750 words): 20% Final essay (2500 words): 60%	Suggested Readings: Articles: Edwards, P. (1975). 'Heidegger and Death as 'possibility'.' Mind 84.1 (1975): 548-66. Nehamas, A. (1983). 'How One Becomes What One Is.' The Philosophical Review, Vol. 92, No. 3: 385-417 Stack, G. (1973). 'Kierkegaard: The Self and Ethical Existence.' Ethics 83.2 (1973): 108-25. Books: Guignon, C., (2003). The Existentialists: Critical Essays on Kierkegaard, Nietzsche, Heidegger, and Sartre. New York: Rowman and Littlefield. Mulhall, S. (2001). Inheritance and Originality: Wittgenstein, Heidegger, Kierkegaard. (Oxford: Clarendon Press.

	Stokes, Patrick (2015). The Naked Self: Kierkegaard and Personal Identity, Oxford: Oxford University Press. Primary Texts: Kierkegaard, Søren (2006). Fear and Trembling. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Nietzsche, Friedrich Wilhelm. (2002). Beyond Good and Evil: Prelude to a Philosophy of the Future. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Heidegger, Martin. (1973). Being and Time. Oxford: Blackwell.

Year 4 Courses

<u>Semester 1</u>

1. Metaethics*
2. Knowledge, Ignorance & Power
3. Philosophy of Well Being*
4. Aristotle
5. Kant
6. Free Will & Moral Responsibility
7. Logic, Computability and Incompleteness
8. Philosophy of Fiction* (x2)
9. Philosophy of Gender and Race* (x2)
10. Philosophy of Simone Weil
11. Environmental Ethics*
12. David Lewis
13. Self, Agency and the Will
14. The Rationalists: Spinoza and Leibniz
15. Special Study in Philosophy*

<u>Semester 2</u>

1. Philosophy of Information
2. Puzzles & Paradoxes
3. Philosophy of Law*
4. Freedom and the State: The Social Contract
5. Philosophy and the Environment
6. Advanced Topics in Metaphysics*
7. Theories of Mind
8. Ethics of Artificial Intelligence
9. Ancient Aesthetics
10. Food for Thought (x2)
11. Objectification, Dehumanisation, and Othering
12. Theory of Virtue
13. Epistemology and Evidence Law
14. Philosophy of Fun & Games
15. Social Cognition
16. Belief, Desire, and Rational Choice
17. Philosophy of Wittgenstein*
18. Philosophy of Time Travel

Semester 1

Metaethics

Lecturer: TBA

Description: Course details will be supplied as soon as a lecturer is appointed. We will email an announcement.

Assessment	Suggested Reading
Midterm Essay: (1500 words, 40%) Final Essay: (2500 words, 60%)	*What is This Thing Called Metaethics,* by Matthew Chrisman

Knowledge, Ignorance & Power

Lecturer: Dr Aidan McGlynn

Description: This course will introduce and examine a range of topics at the intersection of epistemology and political/social/feminist philosophy, examining our actual epistemic practices in light of the relations of power and subordination that exist between differently placed groups in society, and looking at different proposals for how this should shape our theorizing about knowledge and ignorance.

Assessment	Suggested Reading

Midterm Essay: 40% Final Essay: 60%	Collins, Patricia Hill. 1991. ¿Learning From the Outsider Within, in Mary Margaret Fonow and Judith A. Cook (eds), Beyond Methodology: Feminist Scholarship As Lived Experience. Indiana. Collins, Patricia Hill. 2000. Black Feminist Thought: Knowledge, Consciousness, and the Politics of Empowerment. Routledge. Dotson, Kristie. 2011. ¿Tracking Epistemic Violence, Tracking Practices of Silencing¿, Hypatia 26: 236-57. Dotson, Kristie. 2012. A Cautionary Tale: On Limiting Epistemic Oppression, Frontiers 33: 24-47. Fricker, Miranda. 2007. Epistemic Injustice: Power and the Ethics of Knowing. Oxford. Harding, Sandra. 1986. The Science Question in Feminism. Open University. Haslanger, Sally. What Knowledge Is and What It Ought to Be, reprinted in Resisting Reality: Social Construction and Social Critique. Oxford. Haslanger, Sally. On Being Objective and Being Objectified, reprinted in Resisting Reality: Social Construction and Social Critique. Oxford. Intemann, Kristen. 2010. 25 Years of Feminist Empiricism and Standpoint Theory: Where Are We Now, Hypatia 25: 778-96. Jagger, Alison. 1983. Feminist Politics and Human Nature. Harvester. Jagger, Alison. 1989. Love and Knowledge: Emotion in Feminist Epistemology, in A. Garry and M. Pearsall (eds), Women, Knowledge, and Reality: Explorations in Feminist Philosophy. Unwin Hyman. Langton, Rae. Feminism in Epistemology: Exclusion and Objectification, reprinted in Sexual Solipsism: Philosophical Essays on Pornography and Objectification. Oxford. McKinnon, Rachel. Forthcoming. ¿Epistemic Injustice¿. Philosophy Compass. Medina, Jose. 2013. The Epistemology of Resistance: Gender and Racial Oppression, Epistemic Injustice, and Resistant Imaginations. Oxford. Mills, Charles. 1997. The Racial Contract. Cornell. Mills, Charles. 2007. White Ignorance¿, in Shannon Sullivan and Nancy Tuana (eds), Race and Epistemologies of Ignorance. SUNY.

Pohlhaus, Gaile. 2014. Discerning the Primary Epistemic Harm in Cases of Testimonial Injustice, Social Epistemology: 99-114.
Potter, Elizabeth. 2006. Feminism and Philosophy of Science: An Introduction. Routledge.
Stanley, Jason. 2015. How Propaganda Works. Princeton.
Tanesini, Alessandra. 1999. An Introduction to Feminist Epistemologies. Blackwell.
Wylie, Alison. 2003. 'Why Standpoint Matters', in Robert Figueroa and Sandra Harding (eds), Science and Other Cultures: Issues in Philosophies of Science and Technology. Routledge.

Aristotle

Lecturer: Dr Jason Carter

Description: The course will introduce students to the main concepts and arguments of Aristotle's philosophy, and examine the links between Aristotelian and modern philosophy. We will focus first on Aristotle's epistemology, looking at his novel semantic ontology in his Categories and his theory of scientific knowledge in the Posterior Analytics. From there, we will look at Aristotle's attempts in the Physics to define the main concepts of natural science – nature, change, and time, as well as his theory of form and matter. After this, we will examine Aristotle's attempts in the Metaphysics to determine what 'substance' really is, and explore how his conception of substance as 'essence' informs his theory of the soul in the De Anima. We will end with a discussion of Aristotle's controversial claim in the Nicomachean Ethics that a life of virtue is a life of happiness.

Assessment	Suggested Reading
Midterm Essay (1500 words, 40%) Final Essay (2500 words, 60%)	*Suggested Articles*: 'Aristotle', Stanford Encyclopaedia of Philosophy. (https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/aristotle/) Broadie, S. (2007). 'Aristotle and Contemporary Ethics', in *Aristotle and Beyond: Essays on Metaphysics and Ethics*: 113–134. *Books*: Shields, C. (2007). *Aristotle*. London: Routledge, 2007.

	Lear, J. (1988). *Aristotle: the Desire to Understand.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Philosophy of Well-Being

Lecturer: TBA

Description: Course details will be supplied as soon as a lecturer is appointed. We will email an announcement.

Assessment	Suggested Reading
Final Essay (3000 words, 80%) In Class Quizzes (5% each) - Will take place at the beginning of the class in weeks 3 (assessing material from weeks 1 & 2) and in week 10 (assessing material from weeks 7-9). - Will consist of multiple-choice questions and very short answer questions (1-2 sentences). Project (10%) - A project based on the content of the course. - Your task is as follows: Explain, analyse and evaluate some theory, idea, argument,or objection from the course (in any format other than a written essay). You'll be assessed according to the following criteria. (i) How clearly and accurately you explain the relevant (e.g.) theory (ii) How accurately you analyse and how well you evaluate it.	TBA

Kant

Lecturer: Dr Alix Cohen

Description: This course will present a comprehensive picture of Kant's Critique of Pure Reason. We will cover the different questions and arguments of Kant's Transcendental Idealism in the order in which they appear in the Critique. The objective of this course is three-fold. First, to develop a more advanced understanding of Kant's metaphysics and epistemology as presented in the Critique of Pure Reason. Second, to recognise the place of this work in the development of modern philosophy and in the history of philosophy to this day more generally. Third, with a

combination of analysis of primary sources and secondary literature, this course has the aim of enhancing key philosophical abilities such as the analysis and commentary of primary texts and the reconstruction and evaluation of arguments.

Students taking this course will be expected to read the parts of the Critique required for each lecture, together with the relevant secondary literature for each topic. On completion of this course, students should be able to:

1.   Demonstrate a detailed understanding of Kant's Critique of Pure Reason and its place in the history of western thought

2.   State confidently the main doctrines presented in this text

3.   Engage with primary texts by identifying and assessing questions and arguments

4.   Have some awareness of interpretative problems and objections to Kant's theory.

Assessment	Suggested Reading
Participation 5%; Midterm essay (1500 words, 45%); Final essay (2500 words, 50%)	The essential reading for all lectures is the Critique of Pure Reason. You must have access to a copy of it and bring it to class. The following edition is strongly recommended: Kant, Critique of Pure Reason, edited by Norman Kemp Smith, Palgrave

Free Will & Moral Responsibility

Lecturer: Dr Patrick Todd

Description: The course primarily covers the contemporary debate about the relationship between free will and moral responsibility and the doctrine of determinism. Is free will consistent with determinism? If not, what kind of indeterminism could help with free will? Is moral responsibility consistent with determinism even if free will is not? Is the freedom to do otherwise necessary for responsibility? The course further investigates certain normative issues about the concept of moral responsibility. What is it to be morally responsible for an action? Is it simply a matter of being fairly liable to certain moral reactive attitudes? Finally, the course considers conditions on having the moral standing to blame. Even if someone is blameworthy, according to some, it doesn't follow that just anyone else is morally entitled to blame that person. What are the conditions on having this kind of "standing"?

Assessment	Suggested Reading
Mid-term essay of 1,500 words (40%) End-of-semester essay of 2,500 words (60%)	*Four Views on Free Will*, ed. Vargas. Blackwell. "Alternate Possibilities and Moral Responsibility," Frankfurt. An Essay on Free Will. Peter van Inwagen. Freedom Within Reason. Susan Wolf.

Logic, Computability and Incompleteness

Lecturer: Dr Paul Schweizer

Description: This course will focus on key metatheoretical results linking computability and logic. In particular, Turing machines and their formalization in first-order logic, linking uncomputability and the halting problem to undecidability of first-order logic. We will then study recursive functions and their construction, followed by first-order formalizations of arithmetic, particularly Robinson arithmetic and Peano arithmetic. We will then turn to the topic of the arithmetization of syntax and the diagonal lemma, before proceeding to prove some of the main limitative results concerning formal systems, in particular Gödel's two incompleteness theorems,

along with allied results employing the diagonal lemma, including Tarski's Theorem and Lob's Theorem.

Assessment	Suggested Reading
Feedback and formative assessment provided via two compulsory exercise sets. Final mark (100%) is based on a standard 2-hour exam held in the Spring diet. Note: This is a formal course. We strongly recommend that students without a very strong background in mathematics or logic take Logic 2: Modal Logic before enrolling in this course.	*Boolos (Burgess) & Jeffrey, Computability and Logic (any edition*

Philosophy of Fiction

Lecturer: TBA

Description: Course details will be supplied as soon as a lecturer is appointed. We will email an announcement.

Assessment	Suggested Reading
Mid-term essay of 1,500 words (40%) End-of-semester essay of 2,500 words (60%)	

Philosophy of Gender and Race

Lecturer: Prof Tommy Curry

Description: Constructing Others: Racism, Dehumanization, and Sexual Violence.

This course will take its central focus to be the kinds of violence that arises from various Western anthropological impositions and constructions of racialized others. Throughout this course queries into death and dying, rape, and non-being will be illuminated through theories such as Necro-politics, Gendercide, Nihilism, Pessimism, and Social Dominance Orientation. Key figures in this course will be: Frantz Fanon, Achille Mdembe, Jim Sidanius, and Sylvia Wynter. The readings in this course are designed to give students a new grammar to diagnose the substance to the problem of Western-white-Humanism (MAN) and the logics of death that arise from otherization. In short, the student will learn to think through the categories deployed during dehumanization and how this racialization breeds rationalizations for lethal and sexual violence against the other.

Assessment	Suggested Reading
Mid-term essay of 1,500 words (40%) End-of-semester essay of 2,500 words (60%)	Adam Jones, "Gendercide and Genocide," *Journal of Genocide Research* 2.2 (2000): 185-211; Achille Mbembe, "Necro-Politics," *Public Culture* 15.1 (2003): 11-40; Sylvia Wynter, "No Humans Involved," *Voices of the African Diaspora, The CMS Research Review* 8.2 (1992): 13-16; Calvin Warren, *Ontological Terror: Blackness, Nihilism, and Emancipation* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2018); Amalendu Misra, *The Landscape of Silence: Sexual Violence Against Men in War* (London: Hurst & Company, 2015), Jim Sidanius and Felicia Pratto, *Social Dominance Theory: An Intergroup Theory of Social Hierarchy and Oppression* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1999).

Philosophy of Simone Weil

Lecturer: Dr David Levy

Description: We will study Simone Weil's philosophy, including her philosophies of labour and justice; and her conceptions of morality and moral personality; and her pragmatic approach to political institutions as they serve human needs. Our study will proceed through a close reading of central essays or extracts from collected notes and notebooks. Discussion will focus on her texts, less so those of interpreters, so students will learn to read her work. The course will highlight the movement from earlier views oriented around action to later views oriented around attention. This course is oriented around a single philosopher and her work, but attention will also fall on the connections between Weil's philosophy and enduring difficulties in the philosophies of Descartes and Plato; as well as the impact on recent philosophers such as Iris Murdoch. Limited consideration will be given to Weil's writings on spirituality. The focus is philosophical.

Assessment	Suggested Reading
Written Exam 100%	Simone Weil: An Anthology edited by Sîan Miles, Penguin Classics reprint 2005.

Environmental Ethics

Lecturer: Dr Josh Thorpe

Description: In this course we will focus on some of the central theoretical and practical ethical questions arising out of the distinctive relation human beings have to the natural environment. In particular, we will focus on the ethical implications of climate change. In the first part of the course, we will consider several theoretical topics in ethical theory of direct relevance to the ethics of climate change. In the second part of the course, we will explore several practical topics raised by the issue of climate change.

James Garvey's *The Ethics of Climate Change* (2008) is useful background reading for the course.

Assessment	Suggested Reading
40% Two In-Class Assessments. 60% Take-Home Final Test.	*The Ethics of Climate Change* by James Garvey

David Lewis

Lecturer: Dr Brian Rabern

Description: David Lewis (1941–2001) was one of the most important philosophers of the 20th Century. He made significant contributions to philosophy of language, philosophy of mathematics, philosophy of science, decision theory, epistemology, meta-ethics and aesthetics, and most significantly to philosophy of mind and metaphysics. Despite the wide range of issues addressed in Lewis' work there is a unifying method and systematicity. This course is intended to provide an overview of Lewis' contributions by focusing on some of his key writings on various topics such as modal metaphysics, Humean supervenience, analytic functionalism, counterfactuals, counterpart theory, de se content, contextualism about knowledge, scorekeeping in a language game, etc. The course is oriented around a single philosopher and his work, but attention will also be given to the connections between Lewis' philosophy and the enduring problems of traditional philosophy.

Assessment	Suggested Reading
Five essays (300 words, 10% each) Final essay (2500, 50%)	Lewis, Anselm and Actuality Lewis, Counterparts of Persons and Their Bodies Lewis, Attitudes De Dicto and De Se Lewis, Scorekeeping in a Language Game

	Lewis, Truth in Fiction Lewis, Elusive Knowledge Selections from Convention, Counterfactuals, and On the Plurality of Worlds.

Self, Agency, and the Will

Lecturer: Dr Tillman Vierkant

Description:

Assessment	Suggested Reading
Mid-term essay (1500 words, 35%) end of term essay (2500 words, 60%) Autonomous Learning Group work (5%)	

The Rationalists: Spinoza and Leibniz

Lecturer: Dr Pauline Phemister

Description: The course will introduce students to the philosophical systems of the gigantic figures in the history of philosophy, Spinoza and Leibniz. It will explore how, responding critically to but still working within the framework of Cartesian dualism, Spinoza and Leibniz respectively transformed the Cartesian philosophy in two radically different directions, resulting in (i) Spinoza's absolute monism and, in critical response also to Spinoza, (ii) the dynamic, pluralist philosophical system of Leibniz.

Common to Descartes, Spinoza and Leibniz is the aim to construct a rational and internally consistent theory in which metaphysics provides foundational grounding to natural scientific empirical observations and ethical practice. Examination of the work of Spinoza and Leibniz will allow us to assess the degrees to which they succeeded in this quest, examining how, for instance, the metaphysical monism of Spinoza leads to a necessitarianism that poses difficulties for individual ethical agency and freedom and how Leibniz sought through his metaphysical pluralism to overcome these problems.

Assessment	Suggested Reading
Mid-term essay (1500 words, 30%) Final essay (3000 words, 70%)	S. Hampshire, Spinoza and Spinozism M. Della Rocca, Spinoza A. Savile, The Routledge Guide to Leibniz

	P. Phemister, The Rationalists: Descartes, Spinoza and Leibniz

Special Study in Philosophy

Lecturer: TBA

Description: Course details will be supplied as soon as a lecturer is appointed. We will email an announcement.

Assessment	Suggested Reading
Mid-term essay of 1,500 words (40%) End-of-semester essay of 2,500 words (60%)	

Semester 2

Philosophy of Information

Lecturer: Dr Alistair Isaac

Description: This course covers several different conceptions of what information *is* (including Shannon information, semantic information, Kolmogorov information, and ecological information). Each new notion of information is motivated by conceptual questions that philosophers (or philosophically minded statisticians, computer scientists, cognitive scientists, physicists, etc.) have wanted a notion of information to solve. These include epistemic questions (how a notion of information can help us understand inference, for instance), as well as metaphysical questions (does information exist independent of us? Can the universe be reduced entirely to information?)

The course will conclude by looking at information ethics: who owns information about your public/private behavior? Are interactions in a purely informational realm (online multi-player computer games; chatrooms and comment sections) governed by any of the norms of physical interaction?

There is a substantive technical component to this course, as many of the most important analyses of information rely on the mathematics of probability. Students are not required to have any background on these materials, but they should be aware that they will be required to learn and explain some technical definitions as part of the class coursework.

Assessment	Suggested Reading
Midterm Take Home Test (1500 words, 40%) Final paper (2500 words, 60%)	Some representative potential readings include: Dretske, F. (1981) *Knowledge and the Flow of Information.* MIT Press Israel, D. and Perry, J. (1990) "What is Information?" In Philip P. Hanson (ed.), *Information, Language and Cognition.* University of British Columbia Press. Floridi, L. (2005) "Is Semantic Information Meaningful Data?" *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 70(2): 351–370. Adriaans, P. (2009) "Between Order and Chaos: The Quest for Meaningful Information" *Theory of Computing Systems* 45(4): 650–674 Deutsch, D. (2002) "It from Qubit": https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/e61b/fbc6a3 8778e1b83088b124a97f2e5009b464.pdf

	Dibbell, J. (1993) "A Rape in Cyberspace" *The Village Voice*
	Turilli, M. and Floridi, L. (2009) "The Ethics of Information Transparency" *Ethics and Information Technology* 11(2): 105-112.
	Zuboff, S. (2015) "Big other: surveillance capitalism and the prospects of an information civilization" *Journal of Information Technology* 30: 75–89.

Puzzle & Paradoxes

Lecturer: Dr Brian Rabern

Description: Paradoxes have formed a central topic of philosophical investigation, stretching back from Ancient Greece to the present. Paradoxes figure both in influential arguments for philosophical theses and in famous (alleged) refutations of philosophical theses. This course provides an overview of a number of famous philosophical puzzles and paradoxes and important attempts to solve them. In so doing students will be introduced to some important issues in philosophy of language, philosophical logic, decision theory, and formal epistemology. The course will put emphasis on both methodology and philosophical content.

Assessment	Suggested Reading
Presentation: 20% Final Essay: 80%	Sorensen (2005) *A Brief History of the Paradox: Philosophy and the Labyrinths of the Mind*, Oxford University Press. Sainsbury (2009) *Paradoxes*, Cambridge University Press.

Philosophy of Law

Lecturer: Professor Michael Cholbi

Description: Here's a familiar story about the relationship between governments and citizens: Governments issue laws. Citizens are obligated to obey those laws. When they don't, governments are entitled to punish them.

This course will investigate two central presuppositions of this familiar story.

First, what is the basis for our putative obligation to obey the law? Put differently, what lends states their political authority over citizens? Beginning with Plato's Crito, we will critically investigate a number of prominent positive accounts of political authority and citizen obligation to obey the law. These will include that the state is akin to our parents; that we owe obedience to the state as a

matter of gratitude; that we have consented to the state's authority; or that obeying the law is essential to the state's pursuit of justice. We'll also consider two challenges to these positive accounts: that we do not have an obligation to obey laws we conscientiously believe to be unjust, and that there is no intelligible basis for political obligation, as philosophical anarchists maintain.

The other presupposition of this story concerns punishment. Even if the state is morally permitted to punish citizen crime, what justifies the state harming citizens or suspending their rights in the ways that punishment typically does? Here we will critically consider appeals to desert, deterrence, and rehabilitation, as well as the possibility that (as David Boonin has argued) it is morally impermissible for states to punish those who break the law.

Assessment	Suggested Reading
Mid-term essay of 1,500 words (40%) End-of-semester essay of 2,500 words (60%)	http://classics.mit.edu/Plato/crito.html http://www.ditext.com/wolff/anarchy1.html

Freedom and the State: The Social Contract

Lecturer: Dr Alix Cohen

Description: This course will cover key questions in political philosophy regarding classic theories of the state and of political obligation. Social contract theories account in different ways for the general idea that there is an agreement amongst the individuals of a society to be subjected to fundamental social rules, institutions, and principles, and that these contracts have normative character and can be rationally justified. These topics will be explored through the contributions of five political philosophers: Thomas Hobbes, John Locke, Jean-Jacques Rousseau, Immanuel Kant, and John Rawls. We will also look at the feminist/intersectional critiques of social contract theories. The objective of this course is three-fold. First, to introduce students to the key topics concerning social contract theories, such as the legitimacy of the state, the nature of consent in the political context, the possibility of freedom in society, the grounds for civil disobedience, and the relationship between human nature and politics. Second, to provide students with knowledge of the contributions of classic political philosophers and their place in the development of western political thought. Third, with a combination of analysis of primary sources and secondary literature, this course has the aim of enhancing key philosophical abilities such as the analysis and commentary of primary texts, the reconstruction and evaluation of arguments, and the comparison between theories.

Students taking this course will be expected to read the parts of the primary texts required for each lecture, together with the relevant secondary literature for each topic. On completion of this course, students should be able to:

1.   Demonstrate a well-rounded understanding of social contract theories in the history of western thought

2.   State confidently the main doctrines presented in the primary texts

3.   Engage with primary texts by identifying and assessing questions and arguments

4.   Identify objections to the different views and establish comparisons between theories

5.   Establish connections between classic social contract theories and contemporary philosophical views and current events

Assessment	Suggested Reading
Participation: 10%, Midterm Essay: 40%, Final Essay: 50%. Participation consists in presenting to the class a critical discussion of one of the authors' views as applied to a case picked from current political events in a team of 3-4 students	

Philosophy and the Environment

Lecturer: Professor Pauline Phemister

Description: In the course this year, we will be examining the deep ecophilosophy of Arne Naess that takes its inspiration from the monist philosophy of Spinoza and contrasting this with the ecophilosophy of Phemister inspired by the pluralist philosophy of Leibniz. We'll be exploring issues of interconnectedness of living and nonliving entities, the relational identities of living beings, Naess's notions of Self-realisation and wide-identification, as well as questions concerning intrinsic, instrumental, relational, moral, aesthetic and spiritual values. We'll also consider moral and political issues surrounding bio- and onto-egalitarianism, biodiversity and variety, progress and the ideal of perfection.

Assessment	Suggested Reading
Midterm Essay (1500 words, 30%) Final Essay 70%	Arne Naess (1989). *Ecology, Community and Lifestyle. Translated and edited by David Rothenberg (Cambridge University Press)* Pauline Phemister (2016*). Leibniz and the Environment (Routledge)*

Advanced Topics in Metaphysics

Lecturer: Prof Inna Kupreeva

Description: TBC

Assessment	Suggested Reading
Mid-term essay of 1,500 words (40%) End-of-semester essay of 2,500 words (60%)	

Theories of Mind

Lecturer: Dr Paul Schweizer

Description: What is a mind, what are the essential characteristics distinguishing mental from non-mental systems? Two key features traditionally offered in response to this question are (1) representational content: mental states can be about external objects and states of affairs, they can represent and bear content or meaning; (2) conscious experience: only minds are consciously aware and have subjective, qualitative experiences, roughly, there is something it is like to be a mind. A central aim of the course will be to examine the extent to which these two features can be captured or explained by computational and/or physicalist methods, and to explore some of the conceptual issues basic to Cognitive Science and Artificial Intelligence as theoretical approaches to the mind.

Assessment	Suggested Reading
Mid-term essay of 1,500 words (40%) End-of-semester exam (60%)	Chalmers, D., *Philosophy of Mind*, OUP

Ethics of Artificial Intelligence

Lecturer: Dr Mark Sprevak

Description: Artificial intelligence (AI) is developing at an extremely rapid pace. We expect to see significant changes in our society as AI systems become embedded in various aspects of our lives. This course will introduce students to philosophical issues raised by current and future AI systems. No previous familiarity with the literature on AI will be assumed. Questions considered in the course include:

How do we align the aims of autonomous AI systems with our own?

Does the future of AI pose an existential threat to humanity?

How do we prevent learning algorithms from acquiring morally objectionable biases?

Should autonomous AI be used to kill in warfare?

How should AI systems be embedded in our social relations? Is it permissible to fall in love with an AI system?

What sort of ethical rules should AI like a self-driving car use?

Can AI systems suffer moral harms? And if so, of what kinds?

Can AI systems be moral agents? If so, how should we hold them accountable?

How should we live with and understand minds that are alien to our own?

The classes have a different format from that of most other philosophy courses. This format emphasises writing and discussion in class. Students are expected to have read the assigned readings in advance of the class. During class, students discuss the readings and work in small groups to answer questions based on the readings.

Groups may be instructed to argue for a particular case (pro or contra). They may asked to assess the merits of a given view. They may be asked to look for counterexamples to a generalisation or fallacies with a specific argument. They may be asked to find out some background information that is relevant to answering a question. After considering each question, the whole class comes together to discuss what each group has done, synthesize the results, and see how it helps address the topic for the week.

Assessment	Suggested Reading
10% Participation grade (based on contribution to group work in class) 20% Short writing assignment (500 words) 20% Short writing assignment (500 words) 50% End-of-semester essay (2,000 words)	Bostrom, N. (2014), *Superintelligence: Paths, Dangers, Strategies*, Oxford University Press Wallach, W., Allen, C. (2008), *Moral Machines*, Oxford University Press

Ancient Aesthetics

Lecturer: Dr Andrew Mason

Description: The course will examine theories of beauty and the arts (especially, though not limited to, poetry and drama) in ancient thinkers, beginning with Plato and Aristotle; and going on to consider thinkers from later antiquity. Topics discussed include the nature of beauty, artistic representation or imitation, censorship and the place of art in education, and the concept of tragedy. The impact of ancient aesthetic theories on later thought may also be considered.

Assessment	Suggested Reading
Mid-term essay (1,500 words, 40%) End-of-semester Take Home Test (60%)	Primary readings; most of the primary readings for the course can be found in: A. Sheppard and O. Bychkov, eds, *Greek and Roman Aesthetics* D. Russell and M. Winterbottom, eds, *Ancient Literary Criticism: the Principal Texts in New Translations* D. Russell and M. Winterbottom, eds, *Classical Literary Criticism* (a shorter version of the previous volume). Secondary readings: A. Mason, *Ancient Aesthetics.* P. Destrée, ed. *A Companion to Ancient Aesthetics.* A. Laird, ed. *Oxford Readings in Ancient Literary Criticism.*

Food for Thought

Lecturer: Dr Anders Schoubye

Description: The purpose of this class is to consider and discuss a range of ethical issues broadly related to food, e.g. how food is generally produced, how to make ethical food choices, and what the consequences are of current food policy. In the first half of the class, we will focus on questions relating to non-human animals. For example, do non-human animals have moral rights? Is it permissible to cause harm to non-human animals and, if so, under what circumstances? Should we always seek to reduce animal suffering even if that suffering is caused by other animals in the wild? Are there decisive moral reasons for adopting vegetarian or vegan diets or is it possible to be an ethical omnivore? If one opposes current meat production methods, is it irrational to continue to buy meat products?

In the second half of the class, we will focus on issues generally concerning food policy. For example, how (and in what ways) should poor working conditions for workers in the food

industry influence our behavior as consumers? What are the environmental costs of current food production? Should we stick to locally produced and organic foods in order to offset the environmental and health related costs of food production? Do current food policies have a disproportionately negative impact on e.g. children and minorities?

This lectures will be primarily discussion based, so students are expected to have prepared critical questions and to engage in discussion.

Assessment	Suggested Reading
Class participation: 10% Short Writing Assignment 1: 20% Short Writing Assignment 2: 20% Final Essay: 50%	

Objectification, Dehumanisation, and Othering

Lecturer: Dr Aidan McGlynn

Description: This course looks at three ways that certain behaviours, attitudes, institutions, representations, and ways of using language have been morally criticised. At a first approximation, to objectify is to treat or represent a person as a mere thing; to dehumanise is to treat or represent a person as lacking in humanity, for example, as animal-, insect-, or disease-like; while to treat someone as the Other is to enjoy and depend on their recognition of oneself as a subject, while failing to fully reciprocate this recognition. However, these initial characterisations leave crucial questions unanswered. It's left unclear what it is to treat people in these ways, in what ways such treatment might be morally problematic, and to what extent these three notions overlap (and whether we're really dealing with three distinct notions here at all). Moreover, philosophers such as Kate Manne and Mari Mikkola have recently denied the significance of objectification and dehumanisation, while Nancy Bauer has questioned whether philosophers can say anything true and significant about them. This course introduces leading philosophical accounts of objectification, dehumanisation, and othering, and investigates the degree of overlap between the three notions. We will also examine scepticism about the moral, social, and philosophical significance of these notions, looking closely at a number of case-studies in order to assess the plausibility of this kind of scepticism. These case-studies will include pornography, epistemic injustice (Miranda Fricker's term for ways in which one can be harmed in one's capacity as an epistemic subject), and the roles of dehumanising language and imagery in oppression and violence.

Assessment	Suggested Reading
Mid-term essay (1,500 words, 40%) End-of-semester essay (2,500 words, 60%)	Nancy Bauer, 2015, *How to Do Things with Pornography*. Harvard University Press. Simone De Beauvoir, 1949, *The Second Sex*. Vintage. Ann Cahill, 2011, *Overcoming Objectification: A Carnal Ethics*. Routledge. Patricia Hill Collins, 2000, *Black Feminist Thought* (Second Edition). Routledge. Emmalon Davis, 2016, 'Types, Tokens, and Spokespersons: A Case for Credibility Excess as Testimonial Injustice'. *Hypatia* 31: 485-501. Franz Fanon, 1952, *Black Skin, White Masks*. Pluto Press. Franz Fanon, 1961, *The Wretched of the Earth*. Penguin Classics. Miranda Fricker, 2007, *Epistemic Injustice: Power and the Ethics of Knowing*. Oxford University Press. Sally Haslanger, 1993, 'On Being Objective and Being Objectified'. Reprinted in her *Resisting Reality: Social Construction and Social Critique*. Oxford University Press. Timo Jütten, 2016, 'Sexual Objectification'. *Ethics* 127: 27-49. Rae Langton, 2007, *Sexual Solipsism: Philosophical Essays on Pornography and Objectification*. Oxford University Press. Kate Manne, 2017, *Down Girl: The Logic of Misogyny*. Oxford University Press. Aidan McGlynn, 2019, 'Epistemic Objectification as the Primary Harm of Testimonial Injustice'. *Episteme*. Mari Mikkola, 2016, *The Wrong of Injustice: Dehumanization and its Role in Feminist Philosophy*. Oxford University Press.

	Mari Mikkola (ed.), 2017, *Beyond Speech: Pornography and Analytic Feminist Philosophy.* Oxford University Press. Charles Mills, 1997, *The Racial Contract.* Cornell University Press. Martha Nussbaum, 1995, 'Objectification'. *Philosophy and Public Affairs* 24: 249-291. Gaile Pohlhaus Jr., 2014, 'Discerning the Primary Epistemic Harm in Cases of Testimonial Injustice'. *Social Epistemology* 28: 99-114. David Livingstone Smith, 2011, *Less Than Human: Why We Demean, Enslave, and Exterminate Others.* St Martins Press. Lynne Tirrell, 2012, 'Genocidal Language Games'. In Ishani Maitra and Mary Kate McGowan, eds, *Speech and Harm: Controversies Over Free Speech.* Oxford University Press.

Theory of Virtue

Lecturer: Dr Andrew Mason

Description: The course will cover the treatment of virtue in the ancient world (Socrates, Plato, Aristotle and the Stoics), in the mediaeval period (Aquinas), in the early modern period (Hume and Kant), and in more recent philosophy, where it has become central to a distinctive philosophical movement, that of virtue ethics. Topics explored will include moral character, the individual virtues, and the connection of virtue with human happiness or flourishing.

Assessment	**Suggested Reading**

20% Presentation 80% Exam	Plato, Protagoras, Meno, Republic Books II-IV. Aristotle, Nicomachean Ethics, Books I-IV. Aquinas, Treatise on the Virtues. D. Hume, Treatise on Human Nature, Book III, Part 3. and Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals, Appendix 4. I. Kant, The Doctrine of Virtue. D. Statman , ed. Virtue Ethics: A Critical Reader. R. Crisp and M. Slote, eds, Virtue Ethics (Oxford Readings in Philosophy). R. Crisp, ed. How Should One Live? Essays on the Virtues. J. Driver, Uneasy Virtue. A. Macintyre, After Virtue. R. Hursthouse, On Virtue Ethics

Epistemology and Evidence Law

Lecturer: Dr Martin Smith

Description: This course applies theories and ideas from contemporary epistemology to questions and puzzles in the law of evidence – that branch of the law concerned with the proof of facts in legal proceedings. Topics to be covered include the presumption of innocence, the beyond a reasonable doubt standard of proof, sentencing and punishment, character evidence, forensic evidence and eyewitness testimony. The course may also cover, in any given year, topics of particular contemporary interest – such as the use of biometric evidence in criminal prosecution, and the 'corroboration rule' and 'not proven' verdict distinctive of Scots Law.

Assessment	Suggested Reading
Mid-term essay (1,500 words, 40%) End-of-semester essay (2,500 words, 60%)	Ho, H. (2012) 'The presumption of innocence as a human right' in Roberts, P. and Hunter, J. eds. *Criminal Evidence and Human Rights* (Oxford: Hart Publishing) Gardiner, G. (2017) 'In defense of reasonable doubt' *Journal of Applied Philosophy* v34(2), pp221-241 Laudan, L. (2011) 'The rules of trial, political morality and the costs of error: Or, is proof beyond a reasonable doubt doing more harm than good?' in Green, L. and Leiter, B. eds. *Oxford Studies in the Philosophy of Law* (Oxford: Oxford University Press) Redmayne, M. (2008) 'Exploring the proof paradoxes' *Legal Theory* v14, pp281-30

	Roth, A. (2010) 'Safety in numbers – deciding when DNA alone is enough to convict' *NYU Law Review* v85 pp1130-118 Nicolson, D. and Blackie, J. (2013) 'Corroboration in Scots law: 'Archaic rule' or

Philosophy of Fun & Games

Lecturer: Professor Michael Ridge

Description: This course investigates the philosophy of play and the philosophy of games. Games are philosophically interesting in part because manifest something important and distinctive about human nature. While other creatures engage in play, human beings are perhaps the only creatures who play games. Indeed, playing games is plausibly an important part of the good life for creatures like us, and some have argued games would be the only fundamental source of value in Utopia. Games also are plausibly constituted by norms and aims in a way that has made them an attractive model for numerous other philosophically vexatious phenomena – meaning in natural language, morality and beauty, for example. In this course we will investigate the concept of a game, the concept of play and the relationship between these concepts. We also investigate the value of play and games, and the way they figure in a good life as well as their possible role in Utopia.

The core text for the course is Bernard Suits' underappreciated masterpiece, The Grasshopper. Written in the style of a Socratic dialogue, The Grasshopper attempts to turn the classic Aesop's Fable of the ant and the grasshopper on its head. The dialogue opens with the Death of the Grasshopper, in which the Grasshopper is surrounded by his followers and explains why his ideas are worth dying for, and why the life of the ant is so deeply misguided – even paradoxical. The analogy with Plato's The Crito is unmistakable, and very well done. Indeed, The Grasshopper is a masterpiece not only in terms of its philosophical content, but in terms of its literary style.

Suits engages directly with Wittgenstein's thesis that 'game' cannot be defined. Wittgenstein admonishes us not to just assume there must be some definition in the offing but to look and see. Suits takes him at his word, and looks more carefully than Wittgenstein himself seems to have. He systematically develops and defends his definition of 'game' against a battery of objections from his interlocutors. He then explains why the life of the Grasshopper, which consists in playing games rather than working, is superior to the life of the ant. The dialogue concludes with some discussion of Utopia, in which the Grasshopper argues that the playing of games is a kind of master value for human beings which would play a central structuring role in Utopia.

Against the backdrop of Suits' work, which is a foil other readings for the course, we will investigate the following questions (among others):

Is life a game we are playing?

Can 'game', 'play' and 'play a game' be reductively defined?

Is 'game' a family resemblance word?

What interesting relationships hold between play (full-stop) and playing a game?

What (if anything) is the opposite of play?

Is it possible to cheat at a given game while still playing that game?

What makes a game a good one?

Is there something paradoxical about the attitude one must take up to play a game?

Can there be a game with no rules?

Are games well understood in terms of their functions?

What is the role of games in a good life?

What is the role of games in Utopia?

Assessment	Suggested Reading
Midterm Essay (1500 words, 40%) Final Essay (2500 Words, 60%)	The first few chapters of *The Grasshopper*, by Bernard Suits.

Social Cognition

Lecturer: Dr Suilin Lavelle

Description: What is special about human interactions? It is clear that our interactions with other people are quite different to those we have with rocks and trees and tennis balls, but why? One answer, posed by philosophers and psychologists, is that we see other people as having minds, and that this explains our distinctive treatment of them. *Social Cognition* examines this proposition in more detail. Our studies will focus on three questions: *What is it* to think about another person's mind; *How* do we think about other minds; and *When* do we do it?

The course draws on contemporary philosophy of mind, as well as data and theories from developmental psychology and cognitive neuroscience. No prior knowledge of these fields is required for understanding the material. By the end of the course you will be able to draw on material from other disciplines to strengthen philosophical arguments, and have a better understanding of the interplay between philosophy and the sciences.

Assessment	Suggested Reading
Participation (5%;) Midterm essay (1500 words, 30%) End of term essay (2000 words, 65%)	The following materials will give you a sense of some of the topics covered in the course: De Waal, F. (2010). *The age of empathy: Nature's lessons for a kinder society.* Broadway Books.

	N. Eilan, C. Hoerl, T. McCormack, & J. Roessler (Eds.), *Joint Attention: Communication and other minds.* Clarendon Press. Lavelle, J.S. (2019) *The Social Mind.* Routledge. Spaulding, S. (2018) *How we understand others: philosophy and social cognition.* Routledge.

Belief, Desire, and Rational Choice

Lecturer: Dr Wolfgang Schwarz

Description: This course uses lectures and tutorials to introduce formal models of belief, desire, and rational choice. In the first part, we will apply the mathematical theory of probability to represent degrees of belief. We then turn to formal models of desire, drawing on utility theory in economics and value theory in philosophy. Finally, we will cover the basic concepts of decision theory, which formalises the intuition that rational agents do what they believe will bring them closer to satisfying their desires. Throughout, we will consider applications of our models to tackle traditional problems in epistemology, philosophy of mind, philosophy of science, cognitive science, economics, and ethics.

Assessment	Suggested Reading
50% Weekly exercises 50% Final essay. Note exercises will have a formal component	Last year's lecture notes: https://umsu.de/bdrc/bdrc.pdf

Philosophy of Wittgenstein

Lecturer: TBA

Description: Course details will be supplied as soon as a lecturer is appointed. We will email an announcement.

Assessment	Suggested Reading
Mid-term essay of 1,500 words (40%) End-of-semester essay of 2,500 words (60%)	

Philosophy of Time Travel

Lecturer: Dr Alasdair Richmond

Description: Students who successfully complete this course will have received a thorough grounding in all philosophical aspects of the current time travel debate and should be equipped to discuss critically a range of relevant, contemporary philosophical issues in metaphysics and elsewhere. Students will be encouraged to engage critically with the works of such important figures as David Lewis, Kurt Gödel, Kristie Miller, D. H. Mellor and Robin Le Poidevin, amongst others.

Assessment	Suggested Reading
Mid-term essay of 1,500 words (40%) End-of-semester essay of 2,500 words (60%)	David Lewis, 'The Paradoxes of Time Travel', *The American Philosophical Quarterly*, 13, 1976: 145-52; Richard Hanley, 'No End in Sight: Causal Loops in Philosophy, Physics and Fiction', *Synthese*, 141, 2004: 123-52; Stephanie Rennick, 'Things Mere Mortals Can Do, But Philosophers Can't', *Analysis* 75, 2015:22-26.