

PHL 301L In-class writing assignment: Spring 2012

The exercise will take 45 minutes and will take place in class (that is, in the lecture **not** in the section). You will have to answer **three** of the following six questions, which three being revealed at the start of the exercise. **So to be safe you will need to prepare answers to all six questions.** For each question you should aim to prepare an answer that will cover roughly 2.5–3 sides of a blue book, double-spaced. (Count sides like pages in a novel: that is, front and back of a leaf count as two sides.) **You must bring your own blue book (or green book) to section. The exercise is closed-book (and closed notes).** You may write on front and back of each page and you may write in pen or pencil. **Students will be asked to exchange books at the beginning of the exercise; so do not write your name on your book until after the exchange! Students who need special accommodations are advised to send me an e-mail reminding me about them.**

1. Outline Locke's case against innate ideas and principles. How successful do you take his arguments to be? Why?

2. Philonous: "I am content to put the whole upon this issue. If you can conceive it possible for any mixture or combination of qualities or any sensible object whatever to exist without the mind, then I will grant it actually to be so." (Ariew and Watkins, eds., *Modern Philosophy*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, p. 471.)

Discuss the line of argument that begins with this remark, which is often known as Berkeley's "master argument." What is Philonous trying to establish? What reasoning does he employ to try to establish it? How convincing do you find that reasoning to be? Why?

3. A few pages into the First Dialogue, Philonous, who represents Berkeley's position, offers an argument that makes important use of the concept of pain. What exactly is Philonous trying to establish with this argument? How does his argument run? Where would you say the argument is weak? Why?

4. Explain Leibniz's concept of a monad. How do bare monads differ from (a) souls and (b) minds?

5. Kant argues that our representation of space is an a priori intuition. What does this mean? How does he try to argue that our representation of space is a priori? How convincing do you find these arguments to be? Why? (In your answer you should discuss both of the arguments he offers for this conclusion.)

6. *Either* What thesis does Kant argue for in the First Analogy under the title of the "Principle of Permanence of Substance" (See Ariew and Watkins, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition, pp. 769 (foot of second column)–722)? Sketch the argument.

*Or* What does Kant mean by an antinomy? Outline the arguments for the thesis and antithesis of the first antinomy insofar as they apply to the case of time. (There's no need to discuss the parallel argument about space.)