**Course Objectives**

- Acquire a familiarity with the canonical authors and their methods in 20th C. analytic philosophy.
- Contrast and compare key figures in method and conclusions.
- Critically engage with strengths and weaknesses of characteristic analysis and empirical presuppositions.
- Develop an understanding of how 20th C analytic methods endure in other philosophical traditions, as well as what is called “analytic philosophy.”

**LEARNING OUTCOMES**

- Knowledge acquired of a distinctive philosophical tradition and its key figures.
- Exposition, Interpretation, and Criticism of the ideas of specific thinkers.
- Ability to contrast and compare different intellectual perspectives.

**The purpose of the seminar is to engage 20th century analytic philosophy in three different ways:**

(1) Relate twentieth century analytic philosophy to other philosophical traditions and historical periods.

(2) Develop an historical overview of 20th century analytic philosophy

(3) Focus on classic analytic texts in a seminar format (individual and team presentations, and discussion, as well as lecture).

**Materials**

**On BB**
- Kathleen Atkins, “What is it like to be Boring and Myopic?”
- Tyler Burge, “Philosophy of Language and Mind.”
- Plato’s *Republic*, Book I,
- Tarski on Truth
- Anik Waldow, “Empiricism and its Roots in the Ancient Medical Tradition”
- NZ’S Historical Overview of Analytic Philosophy (on blackboard under course documents)

**On Reserve - Knight**
- A.P. Martinich and David Sosa, eds. *Analytic Philosophy: An Anthology*
- A.P. Martinich and David Sosa, eds. *A Companion to Analytic Philosophy*
Grade Components – 1/2 participation and presentations, ¼ first paper, ¼ last paper. Your participation and discussion are the biggest component of the course, as well as the grade, because the aim of the course is to become knowledgeable and fluent about classic problems and key figures in 20th century analytic philosophy. NOTE: **PAPERS MUST BE SUBMITTED BY EMAIL to nzack@uoregon.edu, as attachments in word. I will use track changes for comments and grades.**

**SCHEDULE - Weeks**
I. Introduction, Plato and Waldow
II – III Zack’s overview; Tyler Burge, “Philosophy of Language and Mind”

**Weeks IV – X. WHAT IS TWENTIETH CENTURY ANALYTIC PHILOSOPHY?**

Readings are from Martinich and Sosa, as indicated by author’s last name, proceeding chronologically through that book. In addition, when you are leading the discussion/presenting, you should read the essay in Martinich and Sosa’s *Companion to Analytic Philosophy*. It is hoped but not required that all students will read through all of this secondary source, over the course of the term.

Student discussion leading/presentations will be equally divided over the assigned readings in M and S. Handouts are encouraged but optional, but in reading from notes, please limit what you are reading from to 500 words for each essay. Try not to read, but to talk your way through the main ideas in the text. Please *do* make use of relevant videos from Philosophical Installations. [http://philinstall.uoregon.edu/](http://philinstall.uoregon.edu/) (Our room is set up for this.)

**Week IV – Philosophy of Language**
Frege, “Thought,” and Hilary Putnam, “Meaning and Reference” (secondary sources also)

**Week V - Metaphysics**
First paper due noon Tuesday of Week V: With an awareness of the content of Burge’s article and a focus on Frege’s “Thought” and Putnam’s “Meaning and Reference,” write a 5-6 page double spaced paper about “the problem of meaning and reference.”


**Week VI – Epistemology**

**Week VII – Philosophy of Mind**
Davidson, “Mental Events,” Nagel, “What is it Like to be a Bat? Also and on BB, Kathleen Akins, “What is it Like to be Boring and Myopic?” Lewis, “Mad Pain and Martian Pain” Searle, “Can Computers Think?”
Week VIII- Freedom and Personal Identity

Week IX – Ethics

Week X-Methodology

Last Paper due noon Tuesday of Week XI. Write a 6-7 page essay in answer to the following, referring to the articles in both M and S anthologies, as relevant. NOTE: No two students will be able to write the same paper so a first-come basis for assignment will be in place.

A. Explain and take a side on Strawson’s “On Referring” disagreement with Russell’s “On Denoting.”

B. Explain and take a side on Grice and Strawson’s “In Defense of a Dogma” as criticism of W. V. Quine’s “Two Dogmas of Empiricism.”

C. Explain Frege’s innovation in “On Sense and Reference” and explain clearly in terms of one or two of his predecessors why it is an innovation.

D. Evaluate G.E. Moore’s analysis of the Naturalistic Fallacy, with reference to other sources in ethics.

E. Concerning Nagel and Akins and related writings, do you think we can know what it is like to be a mollusk?

F. Write an essay on Quine’s major themes, with special focus on exactly how he disagrees with Carnap and the philosophical importance of that disagreement, if any.

G. Explain Quine’s debt to Russell and evaluate the ontological results.

H. Write an Essay comparing what Strawson has to say about resentment with what Nietzsche has to say, with attention to their different concerns.

I. Does Ayer succeed in eliminating Metaphysics? How or why not?

J. Explain what Anscombe believes is missing from contemporary ethics. Does Foot avoid Anscombe’s critique?

K. Explain in detail what Moore meant by the naturalistic fallacy and evaluate it in contrast to a thinker from a different philosophical tradition.

L. Compare the early and later Wittgenstein
M. Can computers think? Does Searle understand Behaviorism? Are there any new developments in Cognitive Science that are relevant to these questions?

N. Put Goodman’s new riddle of induction in conversation with Quine’s notion of epistemology naturalized.

O. Drawing on Russell, Wittgenstein, Strawson, and Quine, what can we say about the different ontological statuses of universals and particulars?

"When we run over libraries, persuaded of these principles, what havoc must we make? If we take in our hand any volume of divinity or school metaphysics, for instance, let us ask, Does it contain any abstract reasoning concerning quantity or number? No. Does it contain any experimental reasoning concerning matter of fact and existence? No. Commit it then to the flames, for it can contain nothing but sophistry and illusion."

--David Hume, *An Inquiry Concerning Human Understanding*, 1748

**PAPER WRITING Reminders**

Note: When you get your papers back, there will be comments on ‘track changes--’ so please make sure it’s turned on. The letters in parentheses indicate what aspect of your writing might need improvement and you may see them the second or third time this aspect still needs work.

1. **CLARITY (CL)** Make sure that you define your terms and give reasons for claims. All of your ideas should be explicitly stated and not left to the reader to infer. One difference between philosophy and literature is that philosophers spell everything out, while creative writers depend on the imagination of the reader.

2. **PRECISION (P)** Try not to make vague claims or general statements about the ideas in the readings. Be accurate in reporting the views of others and exact in stating your own.

3. **ORGANIZATION (O)** Organize the ideas in the paper into a few coherent paragraphs. Summarize the main claims of your paper in 2 or 3 sentences that you write after you write the paper, but put at the very beginning of the paper. This is an appropriate introductory paragraph for a philosophy paper, not a filler or a fluffy beginning.

4. **WRITING MECHANICS (WR)** The mechanics include spelling, punctuation, syntax and complete sentence structure. Make sure that you already have these down or consult a source if you don’t. Highly recommended is Strunk and White’s *The Elements of Style*. This is available online at [www.bartleby.com/141/](http://www.bartleby.com/141/)

5. **ANALYSIS (A)** Analyze claims. This means breaking your ideas down into their simpler components, and defining them. Do not start with or rely on dictionary definitions, but use your own words and cite the dictionary only if necessary. Dictionary definitions report usage, whereas a philosophical definition may be critical of current usage or find it vague. Examine the logical consequences of your claims and the claims of others.

6. **CITATION (C)** Cite the required readings this way in your text: (author’s last name, page no.) As well, provide a list of citations at the end of the paper. It is important to do this to show you have done
the required reading and are not just recycling notes from class or discussion group lectures. If you do use material from lecture, please make sure to cite that as well.

7. QUOTATIONS (Q) Quotations should be used to illustrate a claim that you are making about an author. They are not a substitute for explaining the author’s thought in your own words. A good strategy is to state the author’s ideas in your own words first and then “prove” your interpretation with a short quote.

8. DIRECT (D) Be direct. Make sure that you give a direct and focused answer to the question for the paper. This is the most important requirement for papers to reach the B and A range.