

# 101: History of Philosophy

## Reading list and essay questions

Tom Porter, LMH

### The paper

This reading list is divided (see below) into three sections containing various topics, each of which is discussed by one or more of the important philosophers covered by the History of Philosophy paper. We will not have time to cover every topic in tutorial, but you should explore those topics that we do not cover—especially other topics within sections that particularly interest you—during the vacation and your revision.

Within each topic the readings are organised into three categories: introductory, primary, and secondary. Introductory readings are just that. Primary readings are those which provide the focus for the topic. Secondary readings may be divided into three sub-categories: treatments of the same topic by other philosophers whose work is the focus of the History of Philosophy paper; contemporary discussions of the primary readings; and contemporary discussions of the topic. (These sub-divisions are there to help you find your way around; they are not particularly significant in themselves.)

It is essential that you read the texts marked with an asterisk ( \* ) for each topic.

Other reading lists in the History of Philosophy, including the official Philosophy Faculty reading list, can be found online at [www.philosophy.ox.ac.uk](http://www.philosophy.ox.ac.uk).

### Essays

An essay question is appended to each topic's readings. Your essay should be no longer than 2000 words.

I expect you to write an essay for each of our eight tutorials. Your essay in fifth week must be a timed essay: that is to say, an essay which you have planned and written in one uninterrupted hour under examination conditions (i.e. without consulting your books, on your own, somewhere quiet, and by hand). After you have written your timed essay, type it up *with no alterations* and treat it as you would a normal essay.

Ordinary essays should be **no longer than 2000 words**. Please do not ignore this limit. Timed essays can be of any length.

Please hand in your essay by 6pm on the day before tutorials beginning before 1 pm, and by 9am on the day of tutorials beginning after 1 pm. If you hand in your essay late and without good reason, it will not be marked. If you hand it on time, I should normally have marked it within a week.

### Essay plans

In most tutorials, one of the participants will give a presentation of her argument (that is: the argument that she makes in her essay). Please write, therefore, a short presentation of your argument which summarises it step by step, argument by argument, making your conclusion and reasons for arriving at it clear. The presentation should begin by stating your conclusion. The presentation needn't be especially detailed—a series of bullet points upon which you can expand as you present should be fine.

Write your presentation **after you've written the essay, based on what you've written**—not beforehand, and not from memory.

### Topics

#### *Language and thought*

1. Abstract ideas
2. Locke on essence
3. Hume on induction

#### *Matter and reality*

4. Descartes and mind–body dualism
5. Spinoza on substance
6. Locke and Berkeley on material substance
7. Berkeley's reality
8. Hume on causation

#### *Mind*

9. Descartes and self–knowledge
10. Spinoza's parallelism
11. The empiricists on personal identity

## 1. Abstract ideas

### **Introductory reading**

Lowe, *Routledge Philosophy Guidebook to Locke on Human Understanding*, ch. 7

### **Primary reading**

\* Locke, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*:

Book II: ch. 11

Book III: chs. 1–9, especially 1–3

\* Berkeley, *Principles of Human Knowledge*, Introduction

### **Secondary reading**

Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature*, Book I, Part 1, sec. 7

\* Mackie, *Problems from Locke*, ch. 4

\* Jolley, *Locke: his Philosophical Thought*, pp. 49–54

\* Guyer, “Locke’s Philosophy of Language”, in Chappell (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Locke*

\* Dancy, *Berkeley: An Introduction*, pp. 24–37

Chappell, “Locke’s Theory of Ideas”, in Chappell (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Locke*

Winkler, *Berkeley: An Interpretation*, ch. 2

Bennett, *Locke, Berkeley, Hume*, chs. 1–2, 9–10

\* Geach, *Mental Acts*, secs. 5–11

Wittgenstein, *Philosophical Investigations*, secs. 33, 72–4

Wittgenstein, *The Blue and Brown Books*, pp. 1–15

### **Question**

Is Berkeley’s attack on Locke’s account of abstract ideas justified?

## 2. Locke on essence

### Introductory reading

\* Lowe, *Routledge Philosophy Guidebook to Locke on Human Understanding*, ch. 4

### Primary reading

\* Locke, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*

Book II: chs. 12–13

Book III: chs. 3, 5–6

Book IV: chs. 3, 12

### Secondary reading

\* Mackie, *Problems from Locke*, ch. 3 and ch. 5, sec. 3

\* Jolley, *Locke: his Philosophical Thought*, pp. 66–78

\* Ayers, “Locke versus Aristotle on Natural Kinds”, *Journal of Philosophy* 78 (1981)

Ayers, “The Ideas of Power and Substance in Locke’s Philosophy”, in Tipton (ed.), *Locke on Human Understanding*

Guyer, “Locke’s Philosophy of Language”, especially Part IV, in Chappell (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Locke*

Owen, “Locke on Real Essence”, *History of Philosophy Quarterly* 8 (1991)

\* Kripke, *Naming and Necessity*, ch. 3

Putnam, “Meaning and Reference”, in Schwartz (ed.), *Naming, Necessity, and Natural Kinds*

### Question

Are concepts of natural kinds the work of nature or the work of man?

### 3. Hume on induction

#### **Introductory reading**

Skyrms, *Choice and Chance: An Introduction to Inductive Logic*, chs. 1–4

#### **Primary reading**

\* Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature*, Book I, Part 3, secs. 1–14, especially secs. 1–6

\* Hume, *An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding*, sec. IV

#### **Secondary reading**

\* Noonan, *Routledge Philosophy Guidebook to Hume on Knowledge*, pp. 71–75 and pp. 91–131

\* Stroud, *Hume*, ch. 3

\* Bennett, *Learning from Six Philosophers*, ch. 35 (in Vol. 2)

Garrett, *Cognition and Commitment in Hume's Philosophy*, ch. 4

\* Goodman, *Fact, Fiction, and Forecast*, chs. III–IV

\* Blackburn, *Reason and Prediction*, chs. 1, 2, and 4

Barker and Achinstein, "On the New Riddle of Induction", *Philosophical Review* 69 (1960)

Mackie, "The Paradox of Confirmation", *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* 23 (1963)

Strawson, *Introduction to Logical Theory*, ch. 9, part 2

Russell, "The Problem of Induction", in Swinburne (ed.), *The Justification of Induction*

Black, "Self-Supporting Inductive Arguments", in Swinburne (ed.), *The Justification of Induction*

Salmon, "The Pragmatic Justification of Induction", in Swinburne (ed.), *The Justification of Induction*

#### **Question**

What is the problem of induction? Should we be worried?

## 4. Descartes and mind-body dualism

### Introductory reading

Cottingham, *Descartes* (1986), pp. 119–22

Smith and Jones, *The Philosophy of Mind: An Introduction*, Part I, especially chs. III–V

Crane on mind and body (podcast):

<http://cdn2.libsyn.com/philosophybites/CraneMixSess.MP3>

### Primary reading

- \* Descartes, *Meditations on First Philosophy*, including the Preface and Synopsis and with particular focus on the Second and Sixth Meditations
- \* Descartes, *Principles of Philosophy*, Part I, secs. 49–70
- \* Descartes, *Discourse on the Method*, Part IV
- \* Descartes, *Objections and Replies on the Sixth Meditation*

### Secondary reading

- \* Wilson, *Descartes*, ch. 6
- \* Della Rocca, *Spinoza*, pp. 33–41
- \* Dicker, *Descartes: An Analytical and Historical Introduction*, pp. 188–99, 217–33
- Rozemond, *Descartes' Dualism*, ch. 1
- Woolhouse, *Descartes, Spinoza, Leibniz: The Concept of Substance in Seventeenth-Century Metaphysics*, chs. 2, 5, 8–9
- Malcolm, “Descartes’ Proof that his Essence is Thinking”, in Doney (ed.), *Descartes: A Collection of Critical Essays*
- Williams, *Descartes: The Project of Pure Enquiry*, ch. 4
  
- \* Shoemaker, “On an argument for dualism”, in his *Identity, Cause, and Mind*
- Strawson, “Self, Mind, and Body”, in his *Freedom and Resentment*
- Nagel, *The View from Nowhere*, ch. III
- Ryle, *The Concept of Mind*, ch. 1. Reprinted in Doney (ed.), *Descartes: A Collection of Critical Essays*

### Question

Does Descartes show that there is a real distinction between mind and body? Is there one?

## 5. Spinoza and substance monism

### Introductory reading

\* Lloyd, *Routledge Philosophy Guidebook to Spinoza and the Ethics*, pp. 31–48

\* Nadler, *Spinoza's Ethics: An Introduction*, ch. 3

\* Della Rocca, *Spinoza*, ch. 1

Schaffer, "Monism", *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.

<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/monism/>

### Primary reading

\* Spinoza, *Ethics*, Part I

### Secondary reading

\* Della Rocca, *Spinoza*, ch. 2

\* Curley, *Behind the Geometrical Method: a reading of Spinoza's Ethics*, Preface and ch. 1

\* Garrett, "Ethics IP5: Shared Attributes and the Basis of Spinoza's Monism", in Cover and Kulstad (eds.), *Central Themes in Early Modern Philosophy*

Bennett, *A Study of Spinoza's Ethics*, ch. 3–4

Charlton, "Spinoza's Monism", *Philosophical Review* 90 (1981)

Allison, *Benedict de Spinoza: An Introduction*, ch. 3

Donagan, "Spinoza and the Distinction of Attributes", in Grene (ed.), *Spinoza: A Collection of Critical Essays*

Horgan and Potrč, "Bobjectivism and Indirect Correspondence", *Facta Philosophica* 2 (2000). Available from Terence Horgan's website (I have a copy):

<http://dingo.sbs.arizona.edu/~thorgan/papers/Bobjectivism.and.Indirect.Correspondence.htm>

### Question

Why does Spinoza conclude that there is only one substance? Does his argument succeed?

## 6. Locke and Berkeley on material substance

### Introductory reading

- \* Lowe, *Routledge Philosophy Guidebook to Locke on Human Understanding*, ch. 4
- Fogelin, *Routledge Philosophy Guidebook to Berkeley and the Principles of Human Knowledge*, chs. 2–4
- Loux, *Metaphysics: a contemporary introduction*, ch. 3

### Primary reading

- \* Berkeley, *Principles of Human Knowledge*, secs. 1–25
- \* Berkeley, *Three Dialogues between Hylas and Philonous*, First Dialogue
- \* Locke, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, Book II, chs. 12–13, 23, 30, 31

### Secondary reading

Locke–Stillingfleet Correspondence, *The Works of John Locke* (1823 edition), Vol. IV:  
<http://books.google.com/books?id=E-kOAAAIAAJ>, pp. 23–8, 69–91, 157–78, 363–5, 429–40

- \* Mackie, *Problems from Locke*, pp. 72–85
- \* Dancy, *Berkeley: An Introduction*, chs. 2–3, especially pp. 37–40, and ch. 5
- \* Winkler, *Berkeley: An Interpretation*, ch. 6
- Jolley, *Locke: his Philosophical Thought*, ch. 4 and pp. 66–78
- Ayers, “The Ideas of Power and Substance in Locke’s Philosophy”, in Tipton (ed.), *Locke on Human Understanding*
- Warnock, *Berkeley*, chs. 5–6
- Ayers, “Substance, Reality, and the Great, Dead, Philosophers”, *American Philosophical Quarterly* 7 (1970)
  
- \* Van Cleve, “Three Versions of the Bundle Theory”, in Laurence and MacDonald (eds.), *Contemporary Readings in the Foundations of Metaphysics*
- Allaire, “Bare Particulars” and “Another Look at Bare Particulars”, in Laurence and MacDonald (eds.), *Contemporary Readings in the Foundations of Metaphysics*
- Chappell, “Particulars Reclothed”, in Laurence and MacDonald (eds.), *Contemporary Readings in the Foundations of Metaphysics*

### Question

Do we have a coherent concept of material substance?

## 7. Berkeley's reality

### Introductory reading

Fogelin, *Routledge Philosophy Guidebook to Berkeley and the Principles of Human Knowledge*, ch. 5

### Primary reading

- \* Berkeley, *Principles of Human Knowledge*, secs. 1–58
- \* Berkeley, *Three Dialogues between Hylas and Philonous*, p. 234–62 (this page reference refers to the marginal numbers in modern editions)

### Secondary reading

- \* Dancy, *Berkeley: An Introduction*, chs. 4–5
- \* Stoneham, *Berkeley's World*, ch. 8
- Winkler, *Berkeley: An Interpretation*, ch. 6, sec. 8
- Warnock, *Berkeley*, chs. 5–6, 13
- Bennett, *Locke, Berkeley, Hume*, ch. 6
  
- \* Ayer, *The Problem of Knowledge*, ch. 3, sec. 6
- \* Mackie, “What’s Really Wrong With Phenomenalism?”, *Proceedings of the British Academy* 55 (1969)
- Van Cleve, “Three Versions of the Bundle Theory”, in Laurence and MacDonald (eds.), *Contemporary Readings in the Foundations of Metaphysics*
- Fumerton, “Phenomenalism”, in Dancy and Sosa (eds.), *A Companion to Epistemology*

### Question

Does Berkeley's theory leave room for an adequate distinction between appearance and reality?

## 8. Hume on causation

### **Introductory reading**

Crane and Farkas (eds.), *Metaphysics: A Guide and Anthology*, pp. 369–379

Schaffer, “The Metaphysics of Causation”, *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*.

<http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/causation-metaphysics/>

### **Primary reading**

\* Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature*, Book I, Part 3, secs. 1–14, especially secs. 6–14

\* Hume, *An Enquiry Concerning Human Understanding*, secs. V–VII and sec. VIII, para 64

### **Secondary reading**

\* Stroud, *Hume*, ch. 4

\* Noonan, *Routledge Philosophy Guidebook to Hume on Knowledge*, ch. 3

\* Winkler, “The New Hume”, in Read and Richman (eds.), *The New Hume Debate*

Bennett, *Learning from Six Philosophers*, ch. 6 (in Vol. 2)

Pears, *Hume’s System*, chs. 5–7

Garrett, *Cognition and Commitment in Hume’s Philosophy*, ch. 5

Strawson, “David Hume: Objects and Power”, in Read and Richman (eds.), *The New Hume Debate*

Blackburn, “Hume and Thick Connexions”, in Read and Richman (eds.), *The New Hume Debate*

\* Lewis, “Causation”, in his *Philosophical Papers Volume II*

Davidson, “Causal Relations”, in his *Essays on Actions and Events*

Mackie, *The Cement of the Universe*, chs. 1–3

### **Question**

Is causation anything more than constant conjunction?

## 9. Descartes and self-knowledge

### Introductory reading and podcast

Cottingham, *Descartes* (1986), pp. 35–42

Grayling on the *cogito* (podcast):

<http://cdn1.libsyn.com/philosophybites/GraylingDesMixSes.MP3>

### Primary reading

\* Descartes, *Meditations on First Philosophy*, Synopsis of Second Meditation and First and Second Meditations

\* Descartes, *Discourse on the Method*, Part IV

\* Descartes, *Objections and Replies to Meditation 2*

\* Descartes, *Objections and Replies on the cogito*

\* Descartes, *Principles of Philosophy*, Part I, secs. 7–12:

<http://www.philosophy.leeds.ac.uk/GMR/hmp/texts/modern/descartes/principles/dcprinc.html>

### Secondary reading

\* Wilson, *Descartes*, ch. 2

\* Markie, “The Cogito and its Importance”, in Cottingham (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Descartes*

Ayer, “I think, therefore I am”, in Doney (ed.), *Descartes: A Collection of Critical Essays*

Kenny, *Descartes: A Study of his Philosophy*, chs. 3–4

Hintikka, “Cogito Ergo Sum: Inference or Performance?”, in Doney (ed.), *Descartes: A Collection of Critical Essays*

Williams, *Descartes: The Project of Pure Enquiry*, ch. 3

Frankfurt, “Descartes’s Discussion of his Existence in the Second Meditation”, *Philosophical Review* 75 (1966)

\* Ryle, “Self-Knowledge”, in Cassam (ed.), *Self-Knowledge*

Evans, “Self-Identification”, in Cassam (ed.), *Self-Knowledge*

Wittgenstein, *Philosophical Investigations*, secs. 243–308, 412–427

Davidson, “Knowing One’s Own Mind”, in Cassam (ed.), *Self-Knowledge*

### Question

‘So after considering everything very thoroughly, I must finally conclude that this proposition *I am, I exist*, is necessarily true whenever it is put forward by me or conceived in my mind’. What does Descartes take himself to have established here? How? And can he really establish this?

## 10. Spinoza's parallelism

### **Introductory reading**

Della Rocca, *Spinoza*, ch. 3

### **Primary reading**

\* Spinoza, *Ethics*, Part II

### **Secondary reading**

\* Allison, *Benedict de Spinoza: an Introduction*, ch. 4

\* Nadler, *Spinoza's Ethics: An Introduction*, ch. 5

\* Curley, *Behind the Geometrical Method: A Reading of Spinoza's Ethics*, ch. 2

Bennett, *A Study of Spinoza's Ethics*, ch. 6

Della Rocca, *Representation and the Mind-Body Problem in Spinoza*

Odegard, 'The Body identical with the human mind ...' in Freeman and Mandelbaum

(eds.), *Spinoza: Essays in Interpretation*

Delahunty, *Spinoza*, ch. 6

### **Question**

'So after considering everything very thoroughly, I must finally conclude that this proposition *I am, I exist*, is necessarily true whenever it is put forward by me or conceived in my mind'. What does Descartes take himself to have established here? How? And can he really establish this?

## 11. The empiricists on personal identity

### Introductory reading and podcast

Noonan, *Personal Identity*, ch. 1

Perry, "The Problem of Personal Identity", in Perry (ed.), *Personal Identity*

Shields on personal identity (podcast):

[http://cdn1.libsyn.com/philosophybytes/Christopher\\_Shields\\_on\\_Personal\\_Identity.mp3](http://cdn1.libsyn.com/philosophybytes/Christopher_Shields_on_Personal_Identity.mp3)

### Primary reading

\* Locke, *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, Book II, ch. 27

\* Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature*, Book I, Part 4, secs. 2, 5–6; and the Appendix

### Secondary reading

\* Butler, "Of Personal Identity", in Perry (ed.), *Personal Identity*

\* Reid, "Of Identity" and "Of Mr Locke's Account of Our Personal Identity", in Perry (ed.), *Personal Identity*

\* Mackie, *Problems from Locke*, ch. 6

Flew, "Locke and the Problem of Personal Identity", *Philosophy* 26 (1951). Reprinted in Martin and Armstrong (eds.), *Locke and Berkeley*

Jolley, *Locke: his philosophical thought*, chs. 5–6

Noonan, *Routledge Philosophy Guidebook to Hume on Knowledge*, ch. 5

Stroud, *Hume*, ch. 6

Garrett, *Cognition and Commitment in Hume's Philosophy*, ch. 8

\* Williams, "The Self and the Future", in his *Problems of the Self*. Reprinted in Perry (ed.), *Personal Identity*

\* Parfit, *Reasons and Persons*, pp. 199–201 and secs. 78, 83–91, 95–8

Quinton, "The Soul", in Perry (ed.), *Personal Identity*

Grice, "Personal Identity", in Perry (ed.), *Personal Identity*

Strawson, "Self, Mind, and Body", in his *Freedom and Resentment*

Shoemaker, "Personal Identity and Memory", in Perry (ed.), *Personal Identity*

Noonan, *Personal Identity*

### Question

Does the idea of personal identity involve 'confusion and mistake'?