

FACULTY OF PHILOSOPHY  
UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD



# PHILOSOPHY LECTURES PROSPECTUS

## HILARY TERM 2020

*The Philosophy Centre is found at the Radcliffe Humanities Building, on Woodstock Road, which is also the site of the Philosophy and Theology Faculties Library.*

**NOTES:**

- “CL” means the lecture is a Core Lecture for one of the Honour Schools papers.
- The normal duration of an event is one hour. Where the class or lecture lasts longer than an hour, the start time and end time will be given.
- Unless otherwise specified, the lectures and classes are given for all of weeks 1 to 8.
- Lectures and classes begin at five minutes past the hour, and end five minutes before. (E.g: a lecture listed as “M. 10” will start on Mondays at 10.05am, and finish at 10.55am.)
- Students registered on Philosophy courses, and Faculty members, will need their University card to enter the Philosophy Centre at Radcliffe Humanities. Visitors should use the intercom on the front door to ask for access.
- There are several rooms used as lecture/class spaces at Radcliffe Humanities. The main rooms are: the Ryle Room (1<sup>st</sup> floor), the Lecture Room (2<sup>nd</sup> floor), and the Seminar Room (3<sup>rd</sup> floor). Other rooms sometimes used are the Colin Matthew Room (ground floor) and Meeting Room 4 (ground floor).
- There is lift and stair access to all floors. A list of rooms is found by the stairwell and lift on each floor.
- “Schools” refers to the Examination Schools (75 – 81 High Street), one of the main lecturing facilities in the University. If you visit the Schools for a lecture or class, please be sure to check the electronic notice boards in the lobby, which will tell you which room the lecture/class is in.
- Every effort is made to ensure that the information contained in this Prospectus is accurate at the start of term, but sometimes errors persist. If you think you have found a mistake, please contact James Knight ([james.knight@philosophy.ox.ac.uk](mailto:james.knight@philosophy.ox.ac.uk)).

# Lectures for the First Public Examination

Students preparing for their First Public Examination (Prelims or Mods) should attend the following lectures this term:

*PPE, Philosophy and Modern Languages, Philosophy and Theology, Psychology and Philosophy: Moral Philosophy, and General Philosophy*

*Mathematics and Philosophy, Physics and Philosophy, Computer Science and Philosophy: Elements of Deductive Logic, and General Philosophy*

*Literae Humaniores*: any listed Prelims/Mods lecture that corresponds to their chosen Philosophy option for Mods

## **Elements of Deductive Logic**

Dr Wesley Wrigley – T. 12, Schools

Elements of Deductive Logic is primarily a course in *metalogic*. Rather than using the formal system of *The Logic Manual* to prove particular things, as in last term's Introduction to Logic lectures, we'll be proving important general results *about* this formal system. Our focus will be on the metatheory of propositional logic, and we'll examine all the major results up to and including the soundness and completeness of our natural deduction system with respect to the truth table semantics. The course is primarily aimed at students studying philosophy with mathematics, computer science, or physics, but all are welcome. The only set text is *The Logic Manual*, and familiarity with it will be assumed throughout.

## **Early Greek Philosophy**

Prof Marion Durand – M. W. 12 (*weeks 1 to 4*), Schools

These lectures are primarily aimed at students planning to offer the 'Early Greek Philosophy' paper for Lit Hum Mods. Lectures will provide an introduction to Presocratic Philosophy, covering (over the 8 lectures) early Ionian philosophers (Thales, Anaximander, Anaximenes, Xenophanes), Heraclitus, Parmenides, Anaxagoras, Empedocles, and, briefly, Zeno and the atomists.

# Lectures for the Honour Schools

Lectures listed in this section are **core lectures** for the papers in the Honour Schools: that is, these are lectures intended especially for students taking those papers at Finals. Questions set in Finals papers usually take the content of core lectures into account. It is therefore very much in your interest if you are a finalist to attend as many relevant core lectures as your schedule permits.

Students should also refer to the section *Other Lectures*, following. Lectures listed there are not official core lectures, but sometimes cover topics of relevance to the Finals papers.

## **101 Early Modern Philosophy: Berkeley**

Prof Peter Kail – W. 10, Schools

These lectures will consider Berkeley's *A Treatise on the Principles of Human Knowledge* Part I. I shall follow the order of that text and examine Berkeley's key claims, and try to show that his system is more powerful than some commentators think. The key themes covered are Berkeley's background, ideas and abstraction, immaterialism, God, reality, science and the self.

## **102 Knowledge and Reality: Metaphysics**

Prof Ofra Magidor – W. 10, Schools

This lecture series will present in detail some of the main topics from the Metaphysics portion of the Knowledge and Reality paper – e.g. supervenience, persistence, composition, causation, and modality.

## **103 Ethics II: Metaethics**

Dr Joseph Cunningham – Th. 10, Schools

Instead of attempting to settle ethical questions like: *Is fox hunting wrong?* and *Is temperance a virtue?* Metaethics takes a step back and addresses questions *about* such questions, and about our moral thought and talk generally. These lectures will focus on the following four areas of Metaethics:

- i. **Moral Semantics.** We make moral claims – for example, we assert sentences which contain moral predicates. What is the meaning of predicates such as 'good', 'bad', 'wrong', 'permissible' and 'ought'? Do the sentences in which they appear *describe* the world, or do they perform some other function? Are those sentences apt to be true or false?

- ii. **Moral Psychology.** We commit ourselves to the correctness of moral claims – we *endorse* or *subscribe* to various principles and particular moral claims. Our commitment to these things plays a role in our practical lives: the principles and claims to which we're committed figure in deliberation and move us to action. But what sort of mental state is involved in accepting a moral claim? Is it *belief*, or something else? And what is the role that such states play in the practical lives of moral agents? Can we accept a moral claim but fail to be motivated by it?
- iii. **Moral Metaphysics.** Does the world contain moral properties or facts? Are these properties and facts there independent of human thought and experience? If there are such facts and properties, how do they relate to the non-moral properties and facts in existence? Are they natural – like the properties discovered by the sciences?
- iv. **Moral Epistemology.** Does it make sense to say that we can *know* and have *justified beliefs* in moral principles and claims? If so, *how* do we come by moral knowledge and justification?

Overview readings:

- Miller, Alexander. (2013). *Contemporary Metaethics: An Introduction*. 2nd Edition. London: Polity Press.
- Tiberius, Valerie. (2014). *Moral Psychology: A Contemporary Introduction*. London: Routledge.

## 104 Philosophy of Mind

Prof Anita Avramides – M. 10, Schools

**Lecture 1:** This will be an overview of the area. I begin by looking at philosophy's relationship to psychology from the 17<sup>th</sup> century associationalists to contemporary neuroscience. I provide an overview of various positions in philosophy of mind and pause to give an answer to the question: why study philosophy if one is interested in the mind?

**Lecture 2:** Thomas Nagel has written that consciousness is what makes the mind-body problem really intractable. I look at arguments from the work of Nagel, Joseph Levine, Frank Jackson, and Saul Kripke that raise problems for physicalism. I look at two readings of these arguments: metaphysical readings and epistemological readings.

**Lecture 3:** This lecture is continuous with Lecture 2. I look in some detail at Kripke's argument in *Naming and Necessity*. I end by introducing the idea that has come to be known as mysterianism.

**Lecture 4:** In this lecture I give an overview of the problem of intentionality from Brentano

to the present day (well, almost the present day).

**Lecture 5:** This lecture will be devoted to a detailed examination of Davidson's position of anomalous monism.

**Lecture 6:** In this lecture I will examine the place of causation in our understanding of actions.

**Lecture 7:** In this lecture I explore a problem for anomalous monism: epiphenomenalism. I will explain how the problem is thought to arise in Davidson's work, and then look at responses to the problem by Davidson himself, Jerry Fodor, and Frank Jackson.

**Lecture 8:** I end with a consideration of the problem of other minds. I will look at arguments from analogy, best explanation, and the possibility that we can perceive the minds of others.

### **107 Philosophy of Religion**

Prof Rachel Fraser – F. 12, Schools

These lectures consider (i) three important arguments for theism, viz., the ontological, the cosmological, the design argument, (ii) key topics in religious epistemology, for example, the rationality of belief in miracles (iii) the eternality of God, and (iv) the relationship between theism and ethics, viz., the problem of evil and the Euthyphro dilemma.

### **112 The Philosophy of Kant**

Dr Robert Watt – Th. 10, Radcliffe Humanities (Lecture Room)

These lectures will provide an introduction to Immanuel Kant's theoretical philosophy through an examination of some of the topics arising from his *Critique of Pure Reason*. They are primarily intended for those taking the Philosophy of Kant paper (112), but anyone who is interested in the material is welcome to attend. We will cover, amongst other topics, the nature of Kant's critical project; space and time in the first Critique; the Transcendental Deduction; the rejection of transcendent metaphysics; transcendental idealism. Our primary aim will be to try and get an overall sense of Kant's work in theoretical philosophy, partly as a way of understanding why it has exerted such influence and why it continues to attract such fascination. Details of translations and other readings can be found on the Faculty Reading list.

### **113 Post-Kantian Philosophy: Merleau-Ponty and Sartre**

Prof Mark Wrathall – T. 11, Schools

These lectures are designed for students taking the Post-Kantian paper, but anyone interested in 20<sup>th</sup> century French existentialism and phenomenology is welcome to attend. We will study portions of Sartre's *Being and Nothingness* (trans. Sarah Richmond, Routledge 2018) and Merleau-Ponty's *Phenomenology of Perception* (trans. Donald A. Landes, Routledge, 2012).

- Lecture 1 Introduction to Sartre
- Lecture 2 Bad Faith
- Lecture 3 Being-For-the-Other
- Lecture 4 Freedom
- Lecture 5 Introduction to Merleau-Ponty
- Lecture 6 The Body
- Lecture 7 The Perceived World
- Lecture 8 Being-in-the-World

### **113 Post-Kantian Philosophy: Schopenhauer**

Prof William Mander – M. 10 (*weeks 5 to 8*), Schools

These lectures on the philosophy of Schopenhauer will run across the Hilary and Trinity Terms, as follows:

#### Hilary Term

Week 5 – Three arguments for Schopenhauer's idealism

Week 6 – Kant, and three objections to Schopenhauer's idealism

Week 7 – The argument for the world as will

Week 8 – Further exploration of the world as will

#### Trinity Term

Week 1 – Pessimism and the platonic ideas

Week 2 – Aesthetic appreciation

Week 3 – Pessimism, death, and suicide

Week 4 – Character, free-will, ethics, and asceticism

### **113 Post-Kantian Philosophy: Heidegger**

Dr David Batho – T. 12, Schools

This lecture course will focus on Martin Heidegger's *Being and Time*. It will explicate a core argument of the book, while looking in detail at some of the major themes, including: the question of being, being-in-the-world, care, anxiety, conscience, guilt, and death.

### **115 / 130 Plato: *Republic***

Prof Dominic Scott – M. T. 10, Schools

In the first 8 lectures, I shall give an overview of the *Republic*:

1. Introduction to the *Republic*; questions about the value of justice (the challenges of Thrasymachus, Glaucon and Adeimantus)
2. The state–soul parallel and the evolution of the ideal state in books II–IV
3. The tripartite soul in book IV
4. Philosopher–rulers in books V–VI; introduction to the theory of Forms
5. Sun, line, and cave (books VI–VII)
6. The cave allegory and its significance for the the work as a whole
7. The analysis of injustice in books VIII–IX
8. The critique of poetry in book X

In the remaining lectures, I shall pursue selected topics in more depth:

- A. The unity of the *Republic*, especially the relation of book I to the rest of the work
- B. Plato's politics: democracy; women in the state; slavery
- C. Education, especially the importance of music and mathematics
- D. Moral psychology: further analysis of books VIII–IX and their relation to book IV
- E. Plato and the art of persuasion: the *Republic* as a literary work; Plato's attitude to rhetoric, and his use of myth

### **120 Intermediate Philosophy of Physics: Special Relativity**

Prof James Read – M. T. 11 (*weeks 2 to 7*), Radcliffe Humanities (Lecture Room)

This is a twelve-lecture course on the philosophical foundations of special relativity. Topics to be covered include (but may not be limited to):

1. The conceptual status of Newton's laws
2. Galilean covariance
3. The Michelson-Morley experiment and Lorentz's programme
4. Einstein's 1905 derivation of the Lorentz transformations
5. The distinction between principle and constructive theories
6. Spacetime structure: from Newton to Minkowski
7. Generally covariant formulations of physical theories
8. Relativity and conventionality of simultaneity
9. The twins paradox
10. Frame-dependent explanations and Bell's rockets
11. Presentism and relativity
12. Dynamical and geometrical approaches to relativity theory

### **121 Advanced Philosophy of Physics**

Prof Simon Saunders – W. 11 – 1 (*weeks 1 to 4*), Merton College (Fitzjames 2)

Please see the entry for the graduate class on [Philosophy of Physics](#), below.

## **125 Philosophy of Cognitive Science**

Prof Philipp Koralus – W. 12, Radcliffe Humanities (Lecture Room)

These lectures will provide an introduction to the philosophy of cognitive science. Topics will be drawn from those on the Faculty of Philosophy reading list for the FHS Finals paper Philosophy 125. We will spend comparable amounts of time on (1) foundational issues in cognitive science that in one way or another are in the background of most areas of research and (2) the question of how experimental results relate to philosophical issues like consciousness and free will. Various concepts will be illustrated with examples from the scientific literature, but no previous experience with psychology or empirical cognitive science is assumed.

## **127 Philosophical Logic**

Prof James Studd – M. 12 (*all weeks*) and T. 12 (*weeks 1 and 2*), Radcliffe Humanities (Lecture Room)

These are the core lectures for students taking FHS Paper 127. But they may also be of interest to others who want to learn about the technical details and philosophical applications of extensions to (and deviations from) classical logic.

There will also be two additional lectures in weeks 1 and 2. These deal with the mathematical methods used in the course, and are primarily aimed at students who did not take the second logic paper, Elements of Deductive Logic, for Prelims.

The paper is studied in conjunction with a set textbook, Theodore Sider's *Logic for Philosophy* (Oxford University Press). I recommend that you read the indicated sections of the book before attending the lecture each week.

The schedule for the main series of lectures is as follows:

### **Week 1. Classical propositional logic, variations, and deviations**

*LfP 2.1–2.4 (2.5 non-examinable), 3.1–3.4 (3.5 non-examinable)*

Review of syntax and classical semantics for PL; three-valued semantics; supervaluationism

### **Week 2. Modal propositional logic: semantics**

*LfP 6.1–6.3, 7.1–7.3 (7.4 non-examinable)*

Syntax of MPL; Kripke semantics for K, D, T, B, S4 and S5. Deontic, epistemic and tense logic.

### **Week 3. Modal propositional logic: proof theory**

*LfP 2.6, 2.8, 6.4*

Axiomatic proofs for PL. Axiomatic proofs for K, D, T, B, S4 and S5.

**Week 4. Modal propositional logic: metatheory**

*LfP 2.7, 6.5 (Proofs in 2.9, 6.6 non-examinable)*

Soundness and Completeness for MPL. (Proof of completeness is non-examinable).

**Week 5. Classical predicate logic, extensions, and deviations.**

*LfP 4, 5*

Review of the syntax and classical semantics of PC. Extensions of PC.

**Week 6. Quantified modal logic: constant domains**

*LfP 9.1–9.5, 9.7*

Semantics and proof theory for SQML.

**Week 7. Quantified modal logic: variable domains, 2D semantics**

*LfP 9.6, 10*

Kripke semantics for variable domain K, D, T, B, S4, and S5. Two-dimensional semantics for @, X and F.

**Week 8. Counterfactuals.**

*LfP 8*

Stalnaker's and Lewis's semantics for counterfactuals.

Lecture notes and problem sheets will be posted on the course webpage:

<https://jamesstudd.net/phillogic/>

**128 Practical Ethics**

Dr Umut Baysan – F. 10, Schools

These lectures will cover issues that explore our moral obligations in both actual and hypothetical concrete scenarios. We will study a number of traditional debates in practical ethics, such as the treatment of animals, the permissibility of abortion, euthanasia and other end-of-life situations, our obligations to future generations, as well as more contemporary debates due to the advancements of new technologies.

There is no set text-book for these lectures, but those intending to attend can familiarise themselves with the issues covered in Peter Singer's book *Practical Ethics* (any edition) and *Ethics and the Contemporary World* (edited by David Edmonds, Routledge, 2019).

**131/137 Plato on Knowledge, Language and Reality in the *Theaetetus* and *Sophist***

Prof Michael Peramatzis – Th. 12 (*weeks 1 to 6*), Worcester College

The lectures cover some of the most fascinating and rewarding arguments in Plato's late epistemology, philosophy of language, and metaphysics on the basis of his dialogues *Theaetetus* and *Sophist*. The first six lectures in MT19 focused on the *Theaetetus*, Plato's

dialogue about the nature of knowledge, and will discuss the claim that knowledge is perception; being and becoming; the self-refutation of relativism; the refutation of the proposed definition of knowledge as sense perception; knowledge as true belief; false belief; Socrates' dream; knowledge as true belief plus an 'account' (*logos*).

The next six lectures (to be given in HT20) will focus on the *Sophist*, the dialogue where Plato attempts to define what a sophist is, and will examine the method of definition by division; the view that it is impossible to say or think 'what is not'; the discussion of the number and nature of what there is; the view of the so-called 'Late-Learners'; the communion of kinds; the analysis of negative predication; the 'fragmentation' of the kind difference; negative properties; and the analysis of falsehood.

In discussing these topics, we will examine issues of interpretative and philosophical significance.

These twelve lectures are intended primarily for those undergraduate students who will sit paper 131 [Plato on Knowledge, Language, and Reality in the *Theaetetus* and the *Sophist* (in Greek)] or 137 [Plato on Knowledge, Language, and Reality in the *Theaetetus* and the *Sophist* (in translation)], and for students on the MSt in Ancient Philosophy who plan to write their Option A essay on Plato's *Theaetetus* or/and *Sophist*, but anyone with an interest in Ancient Greek Philosophy, Plato's theoretical philosophy, or the history of epistemology, metaphysics, and the philosophy of language is welcome to attend (knowledge of Greek is not required).

Greek Text:

*Platonis Opera I*, ed. by E. A. Duke, W. F. Hicken, W. S. M. Nicoll, D. B. Robinson, and J. C. G. Strachan, (Oxford, 1995).

Suggested English Translation:

*Theaetetus*, tr. Levett, revised by Burnyeat (Hackett, 1990).

*Sophist*, tr. White (Hackett, 1993).

NB: both of these translations are re-printed in J. Cooper's *Plato: Complete Works* (Hackett, 1997).

Hand-outs and further bibliographical suggestions will be given in the lectures.

### **133/138 Aristotle on Nature, Life and Mind**

Prof Ursula Coope – Th. 11, Radcliffe Humanities (Lecture Room)

This course of lectures is designed primarily for undergraduate students taking the paper, Aristotle on Nature Life and Mind, and for MSt students taking this as one of their options. Other graduate or undergraduate students who are interested in the topics are very welcome to attend. There will be 8 lectures in HT and a further 4 lectures in TT.

In HT, we shall look at Aristotle's account of living things and of the changing world they inhabit. Topics to be discussed include: causation, teleology, change, agency, place, time and infinity. These 8 lectures will focus mainly on Aristotle's *Physics*, books 2-4, though we shall look at other passages of Aristotle where appropriate. In TT, we shall turn more particularly to certain questions about sentient, and indeed human, nature, by asking about the nature of perception and thought and about the relation between the mind and the body. These 4 lectures will focus mainly on passages from Aristotle's *De Anima*.

### **134/136/139 Knowledge and Scepticism in Hellenistic Philosophy**

Prof Alexander Bown – T. 12 (*weeks 5 to 8*), Schools

Philosophers of the Hellenistic period engaged in lively debate on the nature and possibility of knowledge: the Stoic and Epicurean schools developed empiricist epistemologies and defended them against the attacks of Academic and Pyrrhonian sceptics. These lectures will introduce some of the central views of those who participated in these debates, and the strategies adopted by the various sides in defending their positive epistemological views, or in arguing for or against a particular kind of scepticism.

This term, I will offer four lectures, in which I will introduce Hellenistic philosophy in general and present the epistemological views of the Stoic and Epicurean schools in particular. I aim both to set out their basic positions and to discuss how they defended themselves against sceptical attack. The lectures will be continued next term by Prof. Luca Castagnoli, who will discuss the Academic sceptics and the Pyrrhonists.

This lecture series is primarily intended for undergraduate students offering papers 134/136/139, but anyone with interest in ancient Greek philosophy and the history of epistemology is welcome to attend (no knowledge of Latin or Greek is required).

### **135 Latin Philosophy**

Prof Simon Shogry – F. 12, Radcliffe Humanities (Lecture Room)

These lectures are primarily aimed at Lit. Hum. undergraduates preparing to take the Latin Philosophy paper, but anyone interested in Stoic ethical thought or the philosophical works of Cicero and Seneca is encouraged to attend.

In the eight lectures this term, we will examine fundamental issues in Stoic ethics, as they are presented in Cicero (*De Finibus* III, *De Officiis* I) and Seneca (*Letters* 92, 95, 121; *De Constantia*; *De Vita Beata*). This task will occasionally require forays into Stoic logic and physics, given the systematic character of Stoic philosophy.

In particular, we will be focusing on the following topics: the Stoic account of happiness and the goal of human action; the role of nature in ethics, and the Stoic theory of 'natural

appropriation' (*oikeiôsis*); the Stoic distinction between being good and being preferred, and whether it is tenable; Stoic arguments for why only virtue is good, and why virtue is sufficient for happiness; the analysis and evaluation of emotions (*pathê*); and whether Stoic ethics is impossibly demanding. Throughout, we will keep in mind philological and literary questions arising from Cicero and Seneca's re-packaging of Greek philosophy for a Roman audience.

### **Introduction to the Philosophy of Science**

Dr Sophie Allen – M. 12, Schools

This course introduces you to some general topics in the philosophy of science. What is science and can we distinguish science from other forms of enquiry? What are scientific theories about? Do scientists discover what there is in the world, or are scientific theories tools with which we predict and explain? Is there a scientific method, and what does it involve? How are scientific theories, models or hypotheses confirmed or rejected? What is the relationship between evidence and theory? Does science make progress? And if so, how does it progress? Is scientific enquiry free from social and cultural influences?

These lectures will not presuppose any prior study of philosophy. They support the options of *History and Philosophy of Science*, available in some Honour Schools in the natural sciences subjects, and the supplementary subject *Philosophy of Science* in the Honour School of Physics. Students considering taking these options are encouraged to come along.

Students should initially approach philosophy tutors in their own colleges in order to arrange tutorial teaching for this course (or ask their own subject tutors to do this for them), although there may also be the possibility of arranging some tutorial teaching at the lectures.

Interested students are referred to past papers on OXAM for some idea of what is covered (search on paper code, using the search term "S00004W1").

## Other Lectures (suitable for all audiences)

### The Tripartition of the Soul in Plato

Ms Alesia Preite – W. 11 (*weeks 1 to 4*), Radcliffe Humanities (Lecture Room)

Plato claims that the soul is divided into three parts: the rational, the spirited and the appetitive. This opens up a series of questions. Why should one think that the soul has three parts? Why not two, or simply one? Why those parts identified by Plato, and not others? What is the nature of these 'parts', and should we call them 'parts' after all? How is each of them related to the body, to its needs and to its parts?

In this course we will discuss the motivations that led Plato to claim that the soul is divided into three. We will attempt to understand whether these motivations are sound, what the rationale behind them is, and how they vary across three different dialogues, the *Republic*, the *Phaedrus* and the *Timaeus*. By so doing, we will both discuss Plato's moral psychology and explore his take on what we now call the mind-body problem.

The first lecture (week 1) will place the soul's tripartition into the broader context of Platonic psychology and contrast it with the 'unitary' model found in the *Phaedo* (*Phaed.* 65a-67b; 78b-84b); it will then start analysing the argument for tripartition found in book IV of the *Republic* (*Resp.* 434c-444e).

The second lecture (week 2) will continue discussing tripartition in the *Republic*, and focus on the problems and the challenges that it raises, particularly in the light of some passages from book IX (*Resp.* 580d-583b) and X (*Resp.* 602c-604e).

The third lecture (week 3) deals with the myth of the winged chariot in the *Phaedrus* (*Phdr.* 246a-256a), and discusses what role the myth plays in the dialogue and how it can contribute to our understanding of tripartition if compared to the non-mythical account of the *Republic*.

The fourth lecture (week 4) will focus on the description of the human soul's tripartition in the *Timaeus* (*Tim.* 69b-73d), analysing how it is related to the embodiment of the (bipartite) rational soul (*Tim.* 41d-47e) and to different bodily parts, and discussing the distinctive form that tripartition takes when considered through the lenses of a teleological natural philosophy.

## **Key Topics in Recent Meta-Ethics**

Mr Farbod Akhlaghi-Ghaffarokh – W. 11 (*weeks 5 to 8*), Radcliffe Humanities (Lecture Room)

### **Lecture Series Outline:**

These lectures will cover recent work on four key topics in meta-ethics within a lecture each: moral supervenience, companions-in-guilt arguments, the problem of creeping minimalism, and so-called relaxed/quietist moral realism. The lectures aim to help students taking FHS *Ethics* by covering in detail some recent work on meta-ethical topics on the Reading List (e.g. *The Metaphysics of Ethics*, and *Value and Normativity*). But no knowledge of the topics will be presumed, those taking *Knowledge and Reality* may benefit from the lectures, and anyone interested is warmly encouraged to attend.

### **Lecture 1: Moral Supervenience**

The assumption that morality supervenes on the non-moral is ubiquitous, with Gideon Rosen calling it the ‘least controversial’ thesis in meta-ethics. But there is surprisingly little discussion of whether this thesis is plausible. And some recent work has cast doubt upon moral supervenience itself and, in turn, arguments that rely upon it. This lecture will address such recent work and ask: what is moral supervenience? Should we accept or reject moral supervenience? What, if anything, follows from the truth or falsity of moral supervenience? And, if we think some form of moral supervenience holds, with what kind of necessity does it hold?

Background Reading:

McPherson, Tristram. (2019). ‘Supervenience in Ethics’. *Stanford Encyclopaedia of Ethics*: §§1-2 & 5

Rosen, Gideon. (Forthcoming). ‘What is Normative Necessity?’. In *Metaphysics, Meaning, and Modality: Themes from Kit Fine*, edited by Mircea Dumitru, Oxford: Oxford University Press (Accessible here: [https://www.academia.edu/9159728/Normative\\_Necessity](https://www.academia.edu/9159728/Normative_Necessity))

### **Lecture 2: Companions-in-Guilt Arguments in Meta-Ethics**

Companions-in-guilt arguments in meta-ethics have recently received significant attention. These arguments raise questions regarding both whether various meta-ethical arguments overreach and, relatedly where appealed to, the relationship between ethics and epistemology, aesthetics, the prudential, and mathematics. This lecture will introduce these arguments and ask: what are companions-in-guilt arguments, what different versions of these arguments are there, how should we assess their success, and are any successful in showing that certain arguments in meta-ethics (such as those for the moral error theory) overreach?

Background Reading:

Cowie, Christopher. (2018). 'Companion-in-Guilt Arguments'. *Philosophy Compass* 13 (11): 1-11

Cowie, Christopher. (2015). 'Good News for Moral Error Theorists: A Master Argument against Companions in Guilt Strategies'. *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* 94 (1): 115-130

### **Lecture 3: The Problem of Creeping Minimalism**

The problem of creeping minimalism is commonly understood to threaten traditional distinctions between seemingly competing theories in meta-ethics (and, if Jamie Dreier is correct, perhaps between realist and anti-realist theories more generally). This lecture will ask: what is the problem of creeping minimalism, why is it taken to threaten much meta-ethical debate, who is it supposed to be a problem for, and are any of the proposed solutions to it from Dreier and others successful? We will also ask whether theorists who have addressed the problem of creeping minimalism have been too quick to think that it is a problem in the first place.

Background Reading:

Dreier, Jamie. (2004). 'Meta-ethics and the Problem of Creeping Minimalism'. *Philosophical Perspectives* 18 (1): 23-44

Dreier, Jamie. (2018). 'The Real and the Quasi-Real: Problems of Distinction'. *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 48 (3-4): 532-547

### **Lecture 4: Moral Realism: Relaxed or Robust?**

The dispute between so-called 'Relaxed/Quietist' and 'Robust' moral realists challenges a number of fundamental assumptions in meta-ethics, including how to understand and to evaluate theories about the metaphysics of morality. The debate is only beginning to receive sustained attention. This lecture will introduce these views and ask: what does the distinction between these theories amount to, what do relaxed/quietist views aim to show, do relaxed/quietist views collapse into other familiar theories, why should we care about this debate, and – focusing on the views of Tim Scanlon, Derek Parfit, Ronald Dworkin, and Matthew Kramer – are any such relaxed/quietist views successful?

Background Reading:

Kremm, Douglas. & Schafer, Karl. (2017). 'Metaethical Quietism'. In *The Routledge Handbook of Metaethics*, edited by Tristram McPherson and David Plunkett, London: Routledge, pp. 643-658

McPherson, Tristram. (2013). 'Quietism'. In *The International Encyclopedia of Ethics*, edited by Hugh LaFollette, Accessed Online, pp. 1-5 (Accessible here: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/9781444367072.wbiee802>)

### **Practical Reason**

Prof Ruth Chang (*Law*) – M. 3 – 5 (*weeks 5 to 8*), University College (10 Merton Street Lecture Room)

A course summary and list of readings are available at: <https://sites.google.com/view/practicalreasonht2020/home>

### **God and the Meaning of Life**

Dr Tim Mawson and Prof Stewart Goetz (Ursinus College) – Th. 11.30 – 1, St Peter's College (History Seminar Room)

This class/seminar is intended primarily for graduate students reading for the M.Phil. or M.St. in Philosophical Theology, though others may attend *with permission from one of the class-givers*. We shall be looking at recent work in the analytic tradition on the relationship between God and the meaning of life. It is intended that, after the first week, papers/book chapters will be circulated and read in advance by those attending, with someone tasked each week with briefly presenting the reading and initiating the discussion. No initial reading is required.

### **Placebos: what, why, and how**

Dr Jeremy Howick – T. 4.30 - 6, Radcliffe Humanities (Lecture Room *except week 8*: Seminar Room)

**How to resister (places limited):** Email [jeremy.howick@philosophy.ox.ac.uk](mailto:jeremy.howick@philosophy.ox.ac.uk)

**Who it is for:** Graduate students, and postdoctoral fellows in any area of philosophy or medicine. Jargon will be avoided, so no prerequisites other than a desire to learn and discuss issues related to placebos are required.

### **About the seminar series**

Whether the treatments we take are believed to be 'effective' often depends on whether they are better than 'placebos' in clinical trials. Understanding what placebos are is therefore important for human health. In spite of this, a great deal of confusion surrounds what placebos are. Contrary to commonly held beliefs, placebos are neither inert nor inactive, and they can have specific effects, especially for treating pain. Following on from the confusions about what they are, debates rage about how to measure their effects, and whether doctors can ethically use them in clinical practice, and whether placebo-controlled trials are ethical if we have an established treatment. In this seminar series, led by Dr. Jeremy Howick, graduate students will read and discuss the meaning of placebos, how to measure their effects, and whether they are ethical.

## Outline of seminars

**Seminar 1.** Introduction, brief history of placebos (in clinical practice) and a note on method.

**Seminar 2.** What is a placebo (in a clinical trial)?

**Seminar 3.** Measurement errors in measuring placebo and nocebo effects.

**Seminar 4.** Special problems with measuring placebos

**Seminar 5.** Double blinding: the importance of being in the dark.

**Seminar 6:** How placebos and nocebos work: a case study of pain.

**Seminar 7.** The ethics of placebos and nocebos in clinical trials and clinical practice

**Seminar 8.** Where placebo research needs to go

## Readings

Based on Dr Howick's forthcoming book; will be emailed to those who register.

### **Wittgenstein's Private Language Arguments**

Dr Peter Hacker – T. 2 - 4, Radcliffe Humanities (Lecture Room)

This course of eight lectures and discussions is concerned with the themes discussed in sections 243-315 of Wittgenstein's *Philosophical Investigations*. Auditors are advised to bring a copy of the *Investigations* (4th edition) with them. These passages are commonly referred to as 'the private language argument'. It would be more appropriate to refer to them as 'the private language arguments, since there are numerous interwoven arguments. In the lectures, I shall disentangle them.

Each lecture will consist of a 50 minute lecture, interspersed with dialogues between myself and a bewildered student. After the lecture there will be an hour set aside for questions and discussion.

The subjects of the lectures are as follows:

1. The private language arguments
2. Private ownership of experience
3. Epistemic privacy of experience
4. Private ostensive definition
5. My mind and other minds
6. The 'inner' and the 'outer'; behaviourism
7. The mereological fallacy
8. Minds and machines

Reading for the course:

*Philosophical Investigations* 243-315; for assistance with the text: P.M.S. Hacker,

*Wittgenstein: Meaning and Mind*, (revised edition) Part 2-Exegesis.  
P.M.S. Hacker, *Insight and Illusion* 2nd edition (1986), chapters 9-10  
Severin Schroeder, *Wittgenstein*, pp. 181-218  
H.-J. Glock, *A Wittgenstein Dictionary*

For comprehensive critical scrutiny of the arguments, see P. M. S. Hacker, *Wittgenstein: Meaning and Mind* (revised edition), Part 1 - Essays, essays 1-9

## Graduate Classes

Graduate classes are, except where otherwise indicated, intended for the Faculty's BPhil and MSt students. Other students may attend, and are welcome, provided they first seek and obtain the permission of the class-giver(s).

With the more popular graduate classes, attendance by those outside of the BPhil and MSt can cause the teaching rooms to become overcrowded. In such circumstances, BPhil and MSt students, for whom these classes are intended, must take priority. Those not on the BPhil or MSt will be expected, if asked by the class-giver(s), to leave the class for the benefit of the intended audience.

### **BPhil Pro-Seminar: Practical Philosophy**

Various class-givers – various locations

*Group 1:* Dr Rebecca Brown – F. 11 – 1, Radcliffe Humanities (Ryle Room)

*Group 2:* Dr Joseph Cunningham – F. 11 – 1, Jesus College (Seminar Room A)

*Group 3:* Prof Cecile Fabre – F. 11 – 1, All Souls College

*Group 4:* Prof Adrian Moore – W. 9 – 11, St Hugh's College

The Pro-seminar introduces students to study, practice, and standards in graduate-level philosophy. Every starting BPhil student will attend four sessions with one class-giver, then change group midway through term for four sessions with another class-giver. Seminars in Hilary Term will cover key material in practical philosophy (broadly: moral philosophy in either metaethics or normative ethics or both; aesthetics and the philosophy of art; political philosophy). Class-givers will contact their groups, specifying readings, in advance of term.

### **Vice in Ancient Philosophy**

Prof Karen Margrethe Nielsen – T. 2 – 4 (*not on in week 5*), Radcliffe Humanities (Ryle Room)

This seminar will explore ancient conceptions of vice (Plato, Aristotle and the Stoics).

In weeks 1-3, we will consider Plato's analysis of vice in *Republic* VIII-IX. What, exactly, is the psychology of vice for Plato? How should we understand the psychological causes of tyranny in particular? Does Plato accept Thrasymachus' moral psychology, and if so, how is the tyrant's lawless desires related to *plenoexia* – the desire to outdo others – which Glaucon calls natural in book II? By Plato's own account, the tyrant is not unlike the rest of us, though he lacks fundamental restraints and a sense of shame. In the absence of such restraints, he pursues the aims that we all wish to pursue, but that we abandon for fear of the consequences. And yet Plato thinks the tyrant pays a price for his greed. Rather than enjoy the greatest freedom and the purest pleasure, the tyrannical soul 'is least likely to do what it wants', claims Plato. 'Forcibly driven by the stings of a dronish gadfly' he 'will be full of disorder and regret' (577e).

We will explore Plato's analysis of the tyrant in the *Gorgias* to cast further light on the *Republic*, and compare the psychopathologies of the tyrant to the vices displayed by the timocratic, oligarchic, and democratic man. Topics include necessary, unnecessary and lawless desires and pleasures, *erôs* and madness.

In weeks 4 and 6, we will examine Aristotle's analysis of vice in the *Nicomachean Ethics*. Aristotle uses a varied vocabulary to describe different vices and their causes, and he recognizes different degrees of vice. He presents a unified account of vice as 'ignorance in the decision' (*hê en têi prohairesei agnoia*, III 1, 1110b31), and argues that vice is due to a mistaken supposition (*hupolêpsis*) about the end. The vicious agent commits to a false conception of the human good. To what extent has Aristotle taken over a Platonic conception of vice, and how do his descriptions of the vicious agent in *EN IX 4* square with his definition of virtue as a mean, with two associated vices, one of excess and one of deficiency? We will examine Aristotle's account of bestiality in VII 5, as well as his analysis of *akrasia* in book VII, to determine how these conditions differ from vices of character.

In the final part of the seminar (weeks 7 and 8) we turn to the Stoics, and their claim that any state short of virtue is a vice. The Stoics further maintain that all vicious agents – or 'fools' – are equally vicious. As Stobaeus puts it in his anthology of Stoic ethics, 'All wrong actions (*hamartêmata*) are equal, and likewise all right actions (*katorthômata*); and all fools (*aphroneis*) are equally foolish since they have one and the same character. But although wrong actions are equal, they contain certain differences, depending on the fact that some of them arise from a hardened and incurable character but others do not' (2.113, 18-23; SVF 3.529, see also Cicero's taxonomy of wrongdoing ('*peccata*') in *De Finibus* 4.56). Is the Stoic hardline dichotomy between virtue and vice as alien to modern sensibilities as it is sometimes made out to be? How does the Stoic position differ from the views defended by Plato and Aristotle?

Time permitting, we will explore Aristotle's analysis of the tragic hero, and ask whether his requirement that the hero should be neither morally outstanding nor vicious allows for character flaws that fall short of vice. The tragic hero, though imperfect, is neither vicious nor akratic, though his character is not in the exact mean either. How is the Stoic conception of vice reflected in Seneca's tragedies, and how does his analysis of vice and passion depart from Aristotle's description of the tragic hero and his flaws in the *Poetics*?

### **The Medieval Debate about Universals**

Prof Cecilia Trifogli – W. 2 – 4, Radcliffe Humanities (Ryle Room)

I will present and discuss two major views in the medieval debate about the ontological status of universals: that of John Duns Scotus and that of William of Ockham. I will cover the following topics:

- (1) Scotus on the existence and ontological status of common natures.
- (2) Scotus's theory of individuation ('haecceity').
- (3) Ockham's arguments against realism about universals.
- (4) Ockham's positive account of universals ('conceptualism').

The texts of Scotus and Ockham are available in English translation in:

*Five Texts on the Mediaeval Problem of Universals*, transl. Paul Vincent Spade, Hackett, Indianapolis 1994, pp. 57-113 (Scotus), 114-231 (Ockham).

Introductory reading:

M. McCord Adams, 'Universals in the early fourteenth century' in: *The Cambridge History of Later Medieval Philosophy*, ed. N. Kretzmann, A. Kenny, J. Pinborg, CUP 1982, pp. 411-439.

### **Narrative, History and Epistemology**

Prof Alex Prescott-Couch – W. 4 – 6, Radcliffe Humanities (Ryle Room)

This seminar will focus on two topics at the intersection of epistemology and the philosophy of history: genealogy and narrative structure. As background, we will consider some recent debates about scientific explanation and historical understanding. We will then focus on genealogy: what is the philosophical relevance of understanding the history of our moral attitudes, political institutions, and social practices? Do genealogies need to be "real history" or can they be fictional or idealized in various ways? Does genealogy help facilitate normative assessment of our current attitudes and practices, and if so, how? Is there a "genealogical fallacy" and, if so, how can it be avoided?

We'll then shift to discussion of narrative structure. Many histories and qualitative social scientific projects employ narratives. However, philosophers have pointed to a number of potential concerns with narrative form: it encourages us to feel that we have understood things when we have not, it focuses attention on individual action at the expense of structural factors, and it discourages rigorous analysis of evidence regarding various descriptive and explanatory claims. We will consider such concerns within a broader investigation into potential benefits of narrative form. Does emplotting events as a narrative serve some positive epistemic function? Does it help us achieve some kind of understanding of persons and events that we cannot easily achieve in other ways? If narrative does have positive epistemic functions, can *fictional* narratives fulfill them as well as real historical narratives? What is a "narrative" anyway?

The seminar will consider these and other questions in surveying recent work on these topics. Besides examining some classic texts, we will discuss some recent papers on these topics by Peter Kail, Matthieu Queloz, and Rachel Fraser, each of whom will be visiting the seminar.

## Philosophy of Science

Prof Adam Caulton– Th. 11 – 1, Radcliffe Humanities (Ryle Room)

In this BPhil course, we will discuss a variety of topics from the contemporary literature. The seminars are intended primarily for students doing the BPhil in Philosophy and the MSt in Philosophy of Physics, but all interested and engaged participants are welcome.

Below are the proposed topics for the classes, in the anticipated order. I will update this document with readings as we progress.

Those attending the class should be sure to have read in advance the target reading(s) for each session. Some background, and some further reading, is also indicated. Roughly, turn to the background readings if the target reading is proving opaque (or more opaque than you feel it should), or if the general area of discussion is unfamiliar (or, indeed, for general edification). Further reading is intended as a jumping-off point for anyone thinking of working on the topic, e.g. for a supervision essay.

Classes will begin with a brief introduction to, or summary of, the target piece (or pieces), as a jumping-off point for discussion. At the first-week class, volunteers will be sought to provide these brief introductions in subsequent weeks.

Topics:

### 1. Chance, credence and the Principal Principle

*Target readings:*

- Hall, N., 'Two mistakes about credence and chance', *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* **82** (2004), pp. 93–111. <https://doi.org/10.1080/713659806>
- Pettigrew, R., 'What Chance-Credence Norms Should Not Be', *Noûs* **49** (2015), pp. 177–196. <https://doi.org/10.1111/nous.12047>

*Background:*

- Lewis, D., 'A subjectivist's guide to objective chance.' *Ifs* (Springer, Dordrecht, 1980), pp. 267–297. Reprinted in his *Philosophical Papers: Volume II*. (OUP, 1987). Online access: <http://solo.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/permalink/f/89vilt/oxfaleph020157456>
- Lewis, D., 'Humean supervenience debugged.' *Mind* **103** (1994), pp. 473–491. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2254396>

*Further reading:*

- Pettigrew, R., 'Accuracy, chance, and the principal principle', *Philosophical Review* **121** (2012), pp. 241–275. <https://doi.org/10.1215/00318108-1539098>

- Ismael, J., 'A modest proposal about chance', *The Journal of Philosophy* **108** (2011), pp. 416–442. <https://doi.org/10.5840/jphil2011108822>
- Rédei, M., & Gyenis, Z., 'Measure theoretic analysis of consistency of the principal principle', *Philosophy of Science* **83** (2016), pp. 972–987. <https://doi.org/10.1086/687879>

## 2. Is the world “dappled”?

*Target readings:*

- Cartwright, N., *The Dappled World* (CUP, 1999), Chapter 1 ('Fundamentalism versus the patchwork of laws'). Online access: <http://solo.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/permalink/f/n28kah/oxfaleph020561477>
- Ruphy, S., 'Is the world really “dappled”? A response to Cartwright’s charge against “cross-wise reduction”', *Philosophy of Science* **70** (2003), pp. 57–67. <https://doi.org/10.1086/367869>

*Background:*

- Cartwright, N., *The Dappled World* (CUP, 1999), Chapters 2 and 3. Online access: <http://solo.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/permalink/f/n28kah/oxfaleph020561477>
- Oppenheim, P. & Putnam, H., 'The Unity of Science as a Working Hypothesis', in G. Maxwell, H. Feigl, & M. Scriven (eds.), *Concepts, Theories, and the Mind-Body Problem* (Minneapolis: Minnesota University Press, 1958), pp. 3–36. Online access: <http://solo.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/permalink/f/n28kah/oxfaleph021117735>

*Further reading:*

- Ladyman, J. & Ross, D., *Every Thing Must Go: Metaphysics Naturalized* (OUP, 2007), Chapter 4. Online access: <http://solo.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/permalink/f/n28kah/oxfaleph020157335>
- McArthur, D., 'Contra Cartwright: Structural realism, ontological pluralism and fundamentalism about laws', *Synthese* **151** (2006), pp. 233–255. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20118800>

## 3. Varieties of reduction

*Target readings:*

- Bickle, J., 'Mental Anomaly and the New Mind-Brain Reductionism', *Philosophy of Science* **59** (1992), pp. 217–230. <https://doi.org/10.1086/289663>
- Dizadji-Bahmani, F., Frigg, R. & Hartmann, S. 'Who's afraid of Nagelian reduction?', *Erkenntnis* **73** (2010), pp. 393–412. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10670-010-9239-x>

*Background:*

- Schaffner, K. F., 'Approaches to reduction', *Philosophy of science* **34** (1967), pp. 137–147. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/186101>
- van Riel, R. & Van Gulick, R., 'Scientific Reduction', *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Spring 2019 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2019/entries/scientific-reduction/>>.

*Further reading:*

- Lewis, D. K., 'How to define theoretical terms', *Journal of Philosophy* **67** (1970), pp. 427–446. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2023861>
- Hoering, W., 'Anomalies of reduction', in W. Balzer, D. A. Pearce & H.-J. Schmidt (eds.), *Reduction in Science: Structure, Examples, Philosophical Problems* (Dordrecht: D. Reidel, 1984), pp. 33-50.
- Sarkar, S., 'Models of reduction and categories of reductionism' *Synthese* **91** (1992), pp. 167–194. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00413566>
- Schaffner, K. F., 'Ernest Nagel and reduction', *The Journal of Philosophy* **109** (2012), pp. 534–565. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/43820725>

#### **4. Emergence**

*Target readings:*

- Humphreys, P., *Emergence: A Philosophical Account* (OUP, 2016), Chapter 2 ('Ontological Emergence'). Online access: <http://solo.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/permalink/f/n28kah/oxfaleph020728150>
- Butterfield, J., 'Emergence, reduction and supervenience: A varied landscape' *Foundations of Physics* **41** (2011), pp. 920-959. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10701-011-9549-0>

*Background:*

- Anderson, P. W., 'More is different', *Science* **177** (1972), pp. 393-396. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1734697>

*Further reading:*

- Butterfield, J., 'Less is different: Emergence and reduction reconciled', *Foundations of physics* **41** (2011), pp. 1065–1135. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10701-010-9516-1>
- De Haro, S., 'Towards a theory of emergence for the physical sciences', *European Journal for Philosophy of Science* **9** (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13194-019-0261-9>

## 5. Reference over theory-change

*Target readings:*

- Ladyman, J., 'Structural realism versus standard scientific realism: the case of phlogiston and dephlogisticated air', *Synthese* **180** (2011), pp. 87–101. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41477546>
- Myrvold, W., "'—It would be possible to do a lengthy dialectical number on this;'"'. Preprint (2019), available at: <http://philsci-archive.pitt.edu/16675/>

*Background:*

- Stein, H., 'Yes, but... Some skeptical remarks on realism and anti-realism', *Dialectica* **43** (1989), pp. 47–65. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/42970610>
- Worrall, J., 'Structural realism: The best of both worlds?', *Dialectica* **43** (1989) pp. 99–124. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1746-8361.1989.tb00933.x>

*Further reading:*

- Chang, H., 'We Have Never Been Whiggish (About Phlogiston) 1.', *Centaurus* **51** (2009), pp. 239–264. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1600-0498.2009.00150.x>
- Schurz, G., 'Structural correspondence, indirect reference, and partial truth: phlogiston theory and Newtonian mechanics', *Synthese* **180** (2011), pp. 103–120. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41477547>

## 6. The signal and the noise

*Target readings:*

- McAllister, J. W., 'The ontology of patterns in empirical data', *Philosophy of Science* **77** (2010), pp. 804–814. <https://doi.org/10.1086/656555>
- Brading, K., 'Autonomous patterns and scientific realism', *Philosophy of Science* **77** (2010), pp. 827–839. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/656816>

*Background:*

- Dennett, D. C., 'Real patterns', *The journal of Philosophy* **88** (1991), pp. 27–51. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2027085>
- Bogen, J. & Woodward, J., 'Saving the phenomena', *The Philosophical Review* **97** (1988), pp. 303–352. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2185445>

*Further reading:*

- Glymour, B. 'Data and Phenomena: A Distinction Reconsidered', *Erkenntnis* **52** (2000), pp. 29–37. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/20012966>

- Woodward, J. "Data, phenomena, signal, and noise." *Philosophy of Science* **77** (2010), pp. 792–803. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/656554>

## 7. Parsimony

### Target readings:

- Sober, E., 'The principle of parsimony' *British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* **32** (1981), pp. 145–156. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjps/32.2.145>
- Baker, A., 'Occam's Razor in science: a case study from biogeography', *Biology & Philosophy* **22** (2007):, pp. 193–215. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10539-006-9027-9>

### Background readings:

- Baker, A., 'Simplicity', *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Winter 2016 Edition), Edward N. Zalta (ed.), URL = <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2016/entries/simplicity/>.

### Further reading:

- Nolan, D., 'Quantitative Parsimony', *The British Journal for the Philosophy of Science* **48** (1997), pp. 329–343. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjps/48.3.329>
- Sober, E., *Ockham's Razors: A User's Manual* (CUP, 2015). <http://solo.bodleian.ox.ac.uk/permalink/f/89vilt/oxfaleph020406986>

## 8. Inductive risk

### Target readings:

- Birch, J., 'Animal cognition and human values', *Philosophy of Science* **85** (2018), pp. 1026–1037. <https://doi.org/10.1086/699744>
- Winsberg, E., Oreskes, N. & Lloyd, E., 'Severe Weather Event Attribution: Why values won't go away'. Preprint (2019), available at: <http://philsci-archive.pitt.edu/16065/>

### Background readings:

- Rudner, R., 'The scientist qua scientist makes value judgments', *Philosophy of Science* **20** (1953), pp. 1–6. <http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/pdfplus/10.1086/287231>
- Jeffrey, R. C., 'Valuation and acceptance of scientific hypotheses', *Philosophy of Science* **23** (1956), pp. 237–246. <http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/pdfplus/10.1086/287489>

### Further reading:

- Alexandrova, A., 'Well-Being as an Object of Science', *Philosophy of Science* **79** (2012), pp. 678–89. <https://doi.org/10.1086/667870>

- Douglas, H. E., 'Inductive Risk and Values in Science', *Philosophy of Science* **67** (2000), pp. 559–79. <https://doi.org/10.1086/392855>
- Steele, K., 'The Scientist qua Policy Advisor Makes Value Judgments', *Philosophy of Science* **79** (2012), pp. 893–904. <https://doi.org/10.1086/667842>

### **Philosophy of Physics**

Prof Simon Saunders – W. 11 – 1 (*weeks 1 to 4*), Merton College (Fitzjames 2)

This course of four classes continues last term's classes on topics in philosophy of physics, and is entirely devoted to the measurement problem (or paradox) of quantum mechanics and its realist solutions. There are three worked-out solutions, pilot-wave theory, dynamical collapse theory, and the many worlds interpretation, a.k.a. the Everett interpretation. The first two involve modifications of quantum mechanics; this course is mainly focused on quantum mechanics as it is, according to the Everett interpretation.

The intended audience includes MSt students in Philosophy of Physics, BPhil and DPhil students interested in probability, metaphysics, and quantum physics, and fourth year Physics & Philosophy undergraduates offering Advanced Philosophy of Physics. Others are welcome if there is space.

### **Schedule**

Week 1. The measurement problem: realist solutions and state of play.

Week 2. Everett's 'long' dissertation

Week 3. Decoherence theory and probability

Week 4. Probability

The following should be read in advance for week 1 (and are easy to find on-line):

J. Bell (1987) 'Against measurement', in *Speakable and Unsayable in Quantum Mechanics*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

H. Everett (1957), "'Relative state'" formulation of quantum mechanics', *Reviews of Modern Physics* **29**, 454–62.

J. Wheeler (1957), 'Assessment of Everett's 'relative state' formulation of quantum mechanics', *Reviews of Modern Physics* **29**, 463-65.

For week 2:

H. Everett (1973), 'Theory of the Universal Wave-function', in De Witt and Graham (eds.), *The Many-Worlds Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics*, Princeton, 1973.

D. Wallace (2012) *The Emergent Multiverse: Quantum theory according to the Everett Interpretation*, OUP Ch.1-3.

For week 3:

S. Saunders (2020), 'The Everett interpretation: Structure', forthcoming in *A Companion to the Philosophy of Physics*, E. Knox and A. Wilson (eds.), Routledge.

S. Saunders (2010), 'Many Worlds? An Introduction', in S. Saunders, J. Barrett, A. Kent, and D. Wallace (eds.), *Many Worlds? Everett, Quantum Theory, and Reality*, OUP.

D. Wallace (2012) *The Emergent Multiverse: Quantum theory according to the Everett Interpretation*, OUP Ch.4

For week 4:

S. Saunders (2020), 'The Everett interpretation: Probability', forthcoming in *A Companion to the Philosophy of Physics*, E. Knox and A. Wilson (eds.), Routledge.

D. Wallace (2012) *The Emergent Multiverse: Quantum theory according to the Everett Interpretation*, OUP Ch.5.

### **Philosophy of Logic**

Prof Volker Halbach and Prof Tim Williamson – M. 11 – 1, Radcliffe Humanities (Ryle Room)

At the beginning of each class we will introduce the topic by presenting an article or book chapter, which all participants will be expected to have read in advance. This will be followed by a discussion.

Topics to be discussed in the seminar may include logical validity, alternative logics, vagueness and semantic compositionality, conditionals, modal predicates, Bealer's argument for ante rem universals, Fitch's paradox, and Yablo's paradox.

The plan is only preliminary and we are happy to adapt it to the preferences of the participants, depending on suitability. Please contact us if you would like to see a specific paper or issue discussed.

For further information, including an up-to-date list of topics and the bibliography, see the web page of the seminar:

<http://users.ox.ac.uk/~sfop0114/lehre/bphil20.html>

### **Topics in language and epistemology**

Prof Bernhard Salow and Dr Matthew Mandelkern – T. 2 – 4, All Souls College

We will explore a variety of topics at the intersection of epistemology and philosophy of language. We will begin in the first session by covering relevant background on formal models of knowledge, belief, and belief-revision. The second session will cover relevant background on the theory of conditionals. Then we will spend three sessions exploring various kinds of ‘weak’ attitude ascriptions (conditionalized attitudes, as in ‘If the gardener committed the murder, I want him behind bars’; knowing-who, as in ‘I know who killed the butler; it was the murderer!’; and weak belief, as in ‘I think it was the gardener, but I don’t know that’). The next three sessions will explore what it takes to know or believe a conditional and what this tells about either epistemic logic or the semantics of conditionals. An up-to-date syllabus, along with links to readings, can be found at <http://users.ox.ac.uk/~sfop0776/tel.html>

### **Aesthetics**

Prof Catharine Abell and Prof James Grant – M. 11 – 1, Exeter College (Quarrell Room)

This class will cover basic issues in the theory of aesthetic value and artistic merit. It is intended as an advanced introduction to these topics. No prior familiarity with aesthetics will be assumed. We will cover the nature, reality, and value of beauty and other aesthetic properties, and examine theories of what makes a work of art good. You will be expected to:

- have done the pre-reading during the vacation
- come to each class with two questions or comments, which can be as elementary as you wish (for instance, clarification questions)
- identify, for each reading, the principal conclusions being defended in it, the reasons offered in support of them, and the main points of disagreement when the authors being read disagree.

### **Pre-Reading:**

Władysław Tatarkiewicz (1980) *A History of Six Ideas: An Essay in Aesthetics*, trans. Christopher Kasparek (Martinus Nijhoff), chapters 4 & 6 (and chapter 5 if possible)

If you cannot access this book, earlier versions of these two chapters are available in:

Władysław Tatarkiewicz (1963) “Objectivity and Subjectivity in the History of Aesthetics,” *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 24 (2): 157-173. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2104458>

Władysław Tatarkiewicz (1972) “The Great Theory of Beauty and Its Decline,” *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 31 (2): 165-180. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/429278>

James Shelley (2017) "The Concept of the Aesthetic," in *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, ed. Edward N. Zalta  
<https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2017/entries/aesthetic-concept/>

### **Week 1: Aesthetic Properties**

Frank Sibley (1959) "Aesthetic Concepts," and (1965) "Aesthetic and Non-Aesthetic," in *Approach to Aesthetics*, ed. John Benson, Betty Redfern and Jeremy Roxbee Cox (OUP, 2001), pp. 1-23, 33-51. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/0198238991.003.0001>  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/0198238991.003.0003>

#### *Optional reading:*

Nick Zangwill (1995) "The Beautiful, the Dainty, and the Dumpy," *British Journal of Aesthetics* 35 (4): 317-329. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/bjaesthetics/35.4.317>

Fabian Dorsch (2013) "Non-Inferentialism about Justification: The Case of Aesthetic Judgements," *Philosophical Quarterly* 63 (253): 660-682.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-9213.12063>

### **Week 2: Dependent Beauty**

Immanuel Kant (1790) *Critique of the Power of Judgment*, ed. Paul Guyer, trans. Paul Guyer and Eric Matthews (CUP, 2000), section 16.  
[http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=206893&site=ehost-live&authtype=ip,uid&ebv=EB&ppid=pp\\_114](http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=nlebk&AN=206893&site=ehost-live&authtype=ip,uid&ebv=EB&ppid=pp_114)

Kendall L. Walton (1970) "Categories of Art," *Philosophical Review* 79 (3): 334-367.  
<https://www.jstor.org/stable/2183933>

Frank Sibley (2001) "Aesthetic Judgements: Pebbles, Faces, and Fields of Litter," in *Approach to Aesthetics*, ed. John Benson, Betty Redfern and Jeremy Roxbee Cox (OUP, 2001), pp. 176-184. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/0198238991.003.0013>

#### *Optional reading:*

Glenn Parsons and Allen Carlson (2008) *Functional Beauty* (OUP), esp chapters 1 & 2.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199205240.001.0001>

Brian Laetz (2010) "Kendall Walton's 'Categories of Art': A Critical Commentary," *British Journal of Aesthetics* 50 (3): 287-306. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/aesthj/ayq017>

Frank Sibley (2001) "Some Notes on Ugliness," in *Approach to Aesthetics*, ed. John Benson, Betty Redfern and Jeremy Roxbee Cox (OUP, 2001), pp. 190-206.  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/0198238991.003.0014>

### Week 3: Objectivity and Realism

David Hume (1757) "Of the Standard of Taste," in *Essays: Moral, Political, and Literary*, ed. Eugene F. Miller (Liberty Fund, 1987), pp. 226-249. [https://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/hume-essays-moral-political-literary-lf-ed#lf0059\\_label\\_352](https://oll.libertyfund.org/titles/hume-essays-moral-political-literary-lf-ed#lf0059_label_352)

Louise Hanson (2018) "Moral Realism, Aesthetic Realism, and the Asymmetry Claim," *Ethics* 129: 39-69. <https://doi.org/10.1086/698732>

#### Optional reading:

John McDowell (1983) "Aesthetic Value, Objectivity, and the Fabric of the World," in *Mind, Value, and Reality* (Harvard University Press, 1998), pp. 112-130.

Eddy M. Zemach (1997) *Real Beauty* (Pennsylvania State University Press).

Christopher Mole (2016) "Real Objective Beauty," *British Journal of Aesthetics* 56 (4): 367–381. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/aesthj/ayw053>

### Week 4: The Value of Beauty

G.E. Moore (1903) *Principia Ethica* (Cambridge University Press), pp. 135-137.

David Wiggins (1976) "Truth, Invention, and the Meaning of Life," *Proceedings of the British Academy* 62: 331-378, section 5 (in the version reprinted in *Needs, Values, Truth*, it is section 6) <https://www.thebritishacademy.ac.uk/pubs/proc/files/62p331.pdf>

Noah M. Lemos (1994) *Intrinsic Value: Concept and Warrant* (CUP), pp. 9–15, 20–26, 95–97.

Anthony Savile (1983) "Beauty and Attachment," in *Pleasure, Preference, and Value*, ed. Eva Schaper (Cambridge University Press), pp. 99-119.

Nick Riggle (2016) "On the Interest in Beauty and Disinterest," *Philosophers' Imprint* 16 (9): 1-14. [www.philosophersimprint.org/016009/](http://www.philosophersimprint.org/016009/)

#### Optional reading:

Christine M. Korsgaard (1983) "Two Distinctions in Goodness," *Philosophical Review* 92 (2): 169–195. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2184924>

Susan Wolf (2011) "Good-for-Nothings," *Proceedings and Addresses of the American Philosophical Association* 85 (2): 47-64. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/41575749>

Richard Moran (2012) "Kant, Proust, and the Appeal of Beauty," *The Philosophical Imagination: Selected Essays* (OUP, 2017), pp. 61-87. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780190633776.001.0001>

## **Week 5: Aesthetic Value and Artistic Value**

Dominic McIver Lopes (2011) "The Myth of (Non-Aesthetic) Artistic Value," *The Philosophical Quarterly* 61 (244): 518–536. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9213.2011.700.x>

Louise Hanson (2013) "The Reality of (Non-Aesthetic) Artistic Value," *The Philosophical Quarterly* 63 (252): 492–508. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-9213.12026>

### *Optional reading:*

James Shelley (2003) "The Problem of Non-Perceptual Art," *British Journal of Aesthetics* 43 (4): 363-378. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/bjaesthetics/43.4.363>

Berys Gaut (2007) *Art, Emotion and Ethics* (OUP), chapter 2  
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199263219.003.0002>

## **Week 6: Experientialism**

Alan H. Goldman (2006) "The Experiential Account of Aesthetic Value," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 64 (3): 333-342. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-594X.2006.00211.x>

James Shelley (2010) "Against Value Empiricism in Aesthetics," *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* 88 (4): 707–720. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00048400903207104>

### *Optional reading:*

Malcolm Budd (2007) "The Intersubjective Validity of Aesthetic Judgements," *British Journal of Aesthetics* 47 (4): 333-371. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/aesthj/aym021>

## **Week 7: Achievementism**

Denis Dutton (1979) "Artistic Crimes: The Problem of Forgery in the Arts," *British Journal of Aesthetics* 19 (4): 302-314. <https://dx.doi.org/10.1093/bjaesthetics/19.4.302>

James Grant (forthcoming) "Art and Achievement," *Philosophical Studies*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11098-019-01324-x>

### *Optional reading:*

Gregory Currie (1989) *An Ontology of Art* (Macmillan).

Jerrold Levinson (2016) "Artistic Achievement and Artistic Value," in *Aesthetic Pursuits* (OUP), pp. 47-59. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780198767213.003.0005>

## Week 8: Ethicism

Berys Gaut (2007) *Art, Emotion and Ethics* (OUP), chapters 3 & 10.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199263219.003.0003> <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199263219.003.0010>

Anne W. Eaton (2012) "Robust Immoralism," *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 70 (3): 281–292. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6245.2012.01520.x>

*Optional reading:*

Noël Carroll (1996) "Moderate Moralism," *British Journal of Aesthetics* 36 (3): 223-238. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/bjaesthetics/36.3.223>

Daniel Jacobson (1997) "In Praise of Immoral Art," *Philosophical Topics* 25 (1): 155-199. <http://dx.doi.org/10.5840/philtopics199725123>

Jonathan Gilmore (2011) "A Functional View of Artistic Evaluation," *Philosophical Studies* 155: 289-305. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11098-010-9570-8>

### Topics in the philosophy of perception

Dr Alex Moran and Dr Dominic Alford-Duguid – M. 2 – 4 (*weeks 1 to 4*) and W. 2 – 4 (*weeks 5 to 8*), University College (Swire Seminar Room)

This graduate seminar will examine a selection of interrelated topics within contemporary philosophy of perception. Each week will focus on a different topic, but the series as a whole will also draw out important connections between the various issues.

The seminar will be co-taught, with the convenors leading students through the material by means of weekly presentations. Background reading will also be set each week, in order to provide relevant context for discussion.

The seminar will run for eight weeks. No prior knowledge of the philosophy of perception will be assumed, nor is any such background knowledge required in order to attend.

Below is the list of topics the seminar will focus on, with associated readings.

### Week 1: The case for representationalism

The dominant theory of perception in contemporary literature is *representationalism*, otherwise known as *intentionalism*. This week will explore the central motivations for this view. A central aim will be to get clear on what reasons there are for accepting representationalism, and whether it deserves the widespread acceptance it currently enjoys.

Primary Reading:

- Chalmers, D. (2004) 'The Representational Character of Experience', in Brian Leiter (ed.), *The Future for Philosophy*. Oxford University Press.
- Siegel, S. (2010) *The Contents of Visual Experience*. Oxford University Press. [Chapter 2]

#### Secondary Reading:

- Pautz, A. (2010) 'Why explain visual experience in terms of content?', in Bence Nanay (ed.), *Perceiving the World*. Oxford University Press.
- Crane, T. (2009) 'Intentionalism' in Beckermann, A. & McLaughlin, B. (eds.), *Oxford Handbook to the Philosophy of Mind*. Oxford University Press.
- Schellenberg, S. (2011) 'Perceptual Content Defended' *Noûs* 45 (4): 714-50.

#### Additional Reading:

- Brewer, B. (2011) *Perception and Its Objects*. Oxford University Press. [Chapter 4]
- Searle, J. (1983) *Intentionality*. Cambridge University Press. [Chapter 2]
- Byrne, A. (2001) 'Intentionalism Defended' *Philosophical Review* 110 (2): 199-240.
- Tye, M. (1995) *Ten Problems of Consciousness*. MIT Press. [Chapter 4]
- Peacocke, C. (1983) *Sense and Content*. Oxford University Press. [Chapters 1-2]
- Hellie, B. (2007) 'Factive Phenomenal Characters' *Philosophical Perspectives* 21: 259-306.

### **Week 2: Disjunctivism and the screening off problem**

The main rival theory to representationalism is known as *naïve realism*. Unlike many theories of perception, naïve realists are disjunctivists: they hold that the kind of experience involved in good cases has a different nature to the kind involved in bad ones. This week explores a fundamental problem for this kind of view, namely, the screening off problem. We will also look at connected issues; for example, we will explore what naïve realists must say about the bad cases.

#### Primary Reading:

- Martin, M. G. F. (2004) 'The Limits of Self-Awareness' *Philosophical Studies* 120 (1/3): 37-89.

#### Secondary Reading:

- Moran, A. (2018) 'Naïve Realism, Hallucination, and Causation: A New Response to the Screening Off Problem' *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* 97 (2): 368-382.
- Sethi, U. (forthcoming) 'Sensible Overdetermination' *Philosophical Quarterly*.
- Johnston, M. (2004) 'The Obscure Object of Hallucination' *Philosophical Studies* 120: 113-183.

#### Additional Reading:

- Sturgeon, S. (2008) 'Disjunctivism About Visual Experience', in *Disjunctivism: Perception, Action, Knowledge*, (eds.) MacPherson, F. & Haddock, A. (Oxford: Oxford University Press): 113–143.
- Siegel, S. (2008) 'The Epistemic Conception of Hallucination' in Adrian Haddock & Fiona Macpherson (eds.), *Disjunctivism: Perception, Action and Knowledge*. Oxford University Press.
- Hellie, B. (2013) 'The Multidisjunctive Conception of Hallucination' In Fiona Macpherson (ed.), *Hallucination*. MIT Press.
- Allen, K. (2015) 'Hallucination and Imagination' *Australasian Journal of Philosophy* 93 (2): 287-302.
- Fish, W. (2009) *Perception, Hallucination, and Illusion*. Oxford University Press. [Chapter 4]
- Miracchi, L. (2017) 'Perception First' *Journal of Philosophy* 114 (12): 629-677.

#### Week 3: Sense data theories and the transparency intuition

A traditional, and once widely accepted, way of thinking about perception is in terms of the notion of *sense-data*. The received view among contemporary philosophers, however, is that the sense-datum theory is deeply flawed. This week we examine whether that's really the case. We also examine related questions about the so-called transparency of experience. Does the 'transparency intuition', whatever it is, rule out a sense-datum theory? If so, what exactly are the constraints that this intuition places on developing a theory of perception?

#### Primary Reading:

- Pautz, A. (forthcoming) 'The Sense-Datum View', in his *Perception*, forthcoming with Routledge.
- Martin, M. G. F (2004) 'The Transparency of Experience' *Mind and Language* 17 (4): 376-425.
- Pitcher, G. (1971) *A Theory of Perception*. Princeton University Press. [Ch. 1]

#### Secondary Reading:

- Price, H. (1932) *Perception*. Greenwood Press. [Ch. V]
- Moore, G. E. (1903) 'The Refutation of Idealism', *Mind*, 12 (48): 433–453.
- Robinson, H. (1994) *Perception*. Routledge [Chapter VI]
- Harman, G. (1990) 'The Intrinsic Quality of Experience' *Philosophical Perspectives* 4: 31-52.
- Tye, M. (2002) 'Representationalism and the Transparency of Experience' *Noûs* 36 (1): 137-51.
- Kind, A. (2003) 'What's so Transparent about Transparency?' *Philosophical Studies* 115 (3): 225-244.

#### Additional Reading:

- Johnston, M. 'A Plea for Expanses' Manuscript.
- Foster, J. (2000) *The Nature of Perception*. Oxford University Press.
- Dennett, D. (1988) 'Quining Qualia' in A. Marcel and E. Bisiach (eds), *Consciousness in Modern Science*. Oxford University Press.
- Crane, T. (2000), in Tim Crane & Sarah Patterson (eds.), *The History of the Mind-Body Problem*. London: Routledge (2000)
- Barnes, W. H. F. (1944) 'The Myth of Sense Data' *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 45 (1): 89-117.

#### **Week 4: Perceptual experience and perception-based thought**

Is there an argument for substantive claims about perception from claims about perception-based thought? And what constraints on a right account of perception do claims about perception-based thought entail? This week examines these and related questions, with particular focus on John Campbell's argument for naïve realism based on perception's role in anchoring perceptual demonstrative thought.

#### Primary Reading:

- Campbell, J. (2002) *Reference and Consciousness*. Oxford University Press. [Chapters 1, 2, 6, 7]
- Dickie, I. (2015) *Fixing Reference*. Oxford University Press. [Chapter 4]

#### Secondary Reading:

- Smithies, D. (2011) 'What is the Role of Consciousness in Demonstrative Thought?' *Journal of Philosophy* 108 (1): 5-34.
- Alford-Duguid, D. 'Thinking Through Illusion' Manuscript.
- Pautz, A. (2011) 'Can Disjunctivists Explain our Access to the Sensible World?' *Philosophical Issues* 21 (1): 384-43.

#### Additional Reading:

- Alford-Duguid, A. & Arsenault, M. (2017) 'On the Explanatory Power of Hallucination' *Synthese* 194 (5): 1765-1785.
- Johnston, M. (2004) 'The Obscure Object of Hallucination' *Philosophical Studies* 120: 113-183.
- Levine, J. (2010) 'Demonstrative Thought' *Mind and Language* 25 (2): 169-195.
- Ivanov, I. (forthcoming) 'Properties in Sight and in Thought' *Synthese*.

#### **Week 5: Perceptual perspective and the problem of illusion**

This week focuses on cases of perceptual illusion and on the perspectival nature of perception. What problems are posed by cases of illusion, and what constraints do cases of illusion place on developing theories of perception? Relatedly, what exactly does it mean to say that perception is perspectival, and how is the perspectival nature of experience connected to the phenomenon of illusion? One central aim is to use these questions to extract constraints for developing a successful theory of perception.

Primary Reading:

- Brewer, B. (2008) 'How to Account for Illusion' in Haddock, A. & Macpherson, F. (eds.) *Disjunctivism: Perception, Action, Knowledge*. Oxford University Press.
- Lande, K. (2018) 'The Perspectival Character of Perception' *Journal of Philosophy* 15 (4): 187-214.

Secondary Reading:

- Macpherson, F. & Batty, C. (2016) 'Redefining Illusion and Hallucination in Light of New Cases' *Philosophical Issues* 26 (1): 263-296.
- Kalderon, M. (2011) 'Color Illusion' *Noûs* 45 (4): 751-775.
- French, C. (2014) 'Naïve Realist Perspectives on Seeing Blurrily' *Ratio* 27 (4): 393-413.

Additional Reading:

- Phillips, I. & French, C. (forthcoming) 'Austerity and Illusion' *Philosophers' Imprint*.
- Burnyeat, M. (1981) 'Conflicting appearances' *Proceedings of the British Academy* 65: 69-111.
- Austin, J. L. (1962) *Sense and Sensibilia*. Oxford University Press.
- Phillips, I. (2016) 'Naïve Realism and the Science of (Some) Illusions' *Philosophical Topics* 44 (2): 353-380.
- Millar, B. (2015) 'Naïve Realism and Illusion' *Ergo* 2: 607-625.

## Week 6: Causation and Perception

In a famous paper, Grice develops a causal theory of perceiving. This week explores whether, and in what sense, we really should think of perceptual experience in causal terms. We also examine whether the causal theory can be developed even within a disjunctivist framework. A related question we'll discuss concerns, more generally, the relationship between perceptual experience and the physical processes which underpin it.

Primary Reading:

- Grice, H. P. 'The Causal Theory of Perception' *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 35 (1): 121-152.

- Snowdon, P. F. (1981) 'Perception, Vision and Causation', *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 81 (1): 175-192.

Secondary Reading:

- Snowdon, P. (1990) 'The Objects of Perceptual Experience' *Proceedings of the Aristotelian Society* 64: 121-150.
- Child, W. (1994) *Causation, Interpretation, and the Mind*. Oxford University Press.
- Moran, A. 'The Causal Argument Revisited', m.s.

Additional Reading:

- Roessler, J. (2011) 'Causation in Commonsense Realism' in Johannes Roessler, Hemdat Lerman & Naomi Eilan (eds.), *Perception, Causation, and Objectivity*. Oxford University Press.
- Snowdon, P. (2011) 'Perceptual Concepts as Non-Causal Concepts' in Johannes Roessler, Hemdat Lerman & Naomi Eilan (eds.), *Perception, Causation, and Objectivity*. Oxford University Press.
- Child, W. (2011) 'Vision and Causal Understanding' in Johannes Roessler, Hemdat Lerman & Naomi Eilan (eds.), *Perception, Causation, and Objectivity*. Oxford University Press.
- Price, H. (1932) *Perception*. Greenwood Press. [Ch. IV]

## **Week 7: Perceptual awareness and structural features of perception**

Perceptual experience's structural features are relatively invariant aspects of experience, such as our awareness of the boundedness of the visual field. Various thinkers have put structural features to work in explaining recalcitrant dimensions of our perceptual phenomenology (e.g. the perception of absence). We shall look at what has been said about structural features, and investigate whether we ought to treat these features as affording a distinct kind of perceptual awareness of the outside world.

Primary Reading:

- Soteriou, M. (2013) *The Mind's Construction*. Oxford University Press [Chapter 5]
- Martin, M. G. F. (1992) 'Sight and Touch' in *The Contents of Experience*. Cambridge University Press.

Secondary Reading:

- Martin, M. G. F. 'Bodily Awareness: A Sense of Ownership' in J. Bermudez, A. Marcel, and N. Eilan (eds.), *The Body and the Self*. MIT Press.
- Alford-Duguid, D. 'On the Epistemic Significance of Perceptual Structure' Manuscript.

- Mac Cumhaill, C. (2015) 'Perceiving Immaterial Paths' *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research* 90 (3): 687-715.
- Price, H. (1932) *Perception*. Greenwood Press. [Chs. VI-VII]

Additional Reading:

- Gomes, A. (2017) 'Naïve Realism in Kantian Phrase' *Mind* 126 (502): 529-578.
- Chalmers, D. (2006) 'Perception and the Fall from Eden' in Tamar S. Gendler & John Hawthorne (eds.), *Perceptual Experience*. Oxford University Press.
- Richardson, L. (2010) 'Seeing Empty Space' *European Journal of Philosophy* 18(2): 227-243.

### **Week 8: Berkeley's puzzle and the epistemology of perception**

What is Berkeley's Puzzle? How is this puzzle to be solved? We focus on this puzzle, discussed in depth in a recent book by John Campbell and Quassim Cassam, as a way into more general questions concerning the epistemological implications of the naïve realist theory of perception.

Primary Reading:

- Campbell, J. & Cassam, Q. (2014) *Berkeley's Puzzle: What Does Experience Teach Us*. Oxford University Press.
- Logue, H. (2012) 'The Skeptic and the Naïve Realist' *Philosophical Issues* 21(1): 268-288.

Secondary Reading:

- Pryor, J. (2000) 'The Skeptic and the Dogmatist' *Noûs* 34 (4): 517-549.
- Evans, G. (1985) 'Things Without the Mind' in Evans, G. *Collected Papers*. Oxford University Press.
- Burge, T. (2009) 'Perceptual Objectivity' *Philosophical Review* 118 (3): 285-324.
- Masrour, F. (2013) 'Phenomenal Objectivity and Phenomenal Intentionality: In Defense of a Kantian Account' in Uriah Kriegel (ed.), *Phenomenal Intentionality*. Oxford University Press.

Additional Reading:

- Logue, H. (2018) 'World in Mind: Extending Phenomenal Character and Resisting Skepticism' in Johan Gersel, Morten Sorensen Thaning, and Rasmus Thybo Jensen (eds), *In the Light of Experience: Essays on Reasons and Perception*. Oxford University Press.
- Strawson, P. F. (1959) *Individuals*. Methuen. [Chapter 2]
- Silins, N. (2011) 'Seeing Through the "Veil of Perception"' *Mind* 120 (478): 329-367.

- Brewer, B. (2011) *Perception and Its Objects*. Oxford University Press. [Chs. 5-6]

## Regular Faculty Seminars

The programmes of the Faculty seminars are no longer included in this Lecture Prospectus, since running lists are often not settled by the time this Prospectus is published. Instead, students and Faculty members are referred to the weekly events digest, sent from the Faculty in each week of term, which includes details of each of the seminars (often with a linked abstract). Interested parties may also refer to seminars' individual webpages, where one exists.

The Faculty seminars listed here all take place in some weeks of each term of the year, at Radcliffe Humanities (either in the Ryle Room or the Lecture Room) unless otherwise indicated. The usual schedule is given as a guide, but should be checked in any term against that term's Lecture List, or the digest for the week.

- Monday**
- Moral Philosophy Seminar**  
Usual schedule: weekly, 4.30 to 6.30, Lecture Room  
Webpage: [http://www.philosophy.ox.ac.uk/lectures/moral\\_philosophy](http://www.philosophy.ox.ac.uk/lectures/moral_philosophy)
- Philosophy of Mathematics Seminar**  
Usual schedule: weeks vary; 4.30 to 6.30, Ryle Room  
Webpage: <http://users.ox.ac.uk/~philmath/pomseminar.html>
- Tuesdays**
- Post-Kantian European Philosophy Seminar**  
Usual schedule: even-numbered weeks, 5 to 7, Ryle Room  
Webpage: [http://www.philosophy.ox.ac.uk/lectures/the\\_postkantian\\_seminar](http://www.philosophy.ox.ac.uk/lectures/the_postkantian_seminar)
- Aesthetics Seminar (Hilary Term only)**  
Usual schedule: every other week, 4 to 6, Exeter College  
See events digest, or contact convener ([James Grant](#)) for information
- Thursdays**
- Workshop in Ancient Philosophy**  
Usual schedule: weekly, 4.30 to 6, Ryle Room  
Webpage: [http://www.philosophy.ox.ac.uk/lectures/workshop\\_in\\_ancient\\_philosophy](http://www.philosophy.ox.ac.uk/lectures/workshop_in_ancient_philosophy)
- Philosophy of Physics Seminar**  
Usual schedule: weekly, 4.30 to 6.30, Lecture Room  
Webpage: <http://www.philosophy-of-physics.ox.ac.uk/tag/thursday-seminars/>
- Fridays**
- Jowett Society / Philosophical Society**  
Usual schedule: weekly, 3.30 to 5.30, Lecture Room  
Webpage: <https://jowettsociety.wordpress.com/>

In addition to these, there are usually "work in progress" groups, or WIPs: most commonly, the Theoretical Philosophy WIP (<http://users.ox.ac.uk/~twip/>), and in some terms a Mind WIP meets.

