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PL450A-51, *Socratic Intellectualism*

SEMINAR SYLLABUS: FALL, 2011

*Dr. P. J. Mooney, Department of Philosophy, John Carroll University*

---

Semin**ar Schedule, Location.

M,W, 3:30-4:45, AD25.

**Seminar Description.** ‘Intellectualism’ describes a set of philosophical views often attributed to the Socrates appearing in most of Plato’s early dialogues. Not all scholars believe that Socrates is an intellectualist; not all intellectualists agree upon the theory’s details. Perhaps needless to say, philosophers differ over how plausible intellectualism is.

Intellectualism maintains that, for Socrates, the sources of all human action are rational and never irrational. The only motivation to act is the desire for what’s best for the person, and only the person’s beliefs about what’s best that give the motivation direction (i.e., that determines that this, rather than that, is the best alternative in the present circumstances). There are neither good-neutral desires, nor are there non-intellectual ways in which motivation is given direction. Instead, all action results from the combination of one’s desires with the person’s beliefs about what actions, if taken, will best satisfy the desire. It is but a short road from these premises to the view that, therefore, human virtue (arête) is nothing other than knowledge of the good. Human excellence is being happy; and that result can occur only if one’s beliefs about the good are all correct; and that can only happen if one has knowledge of the good. Contrary to many modern views, then, human goodness has nothing whatever to do with having a good will or good intentions, values, and so on. Virtue is, thus, a science, and not a matter of morality.

Our seminar will approach these dialogues as though Socrates is an intellectualist (though keeping an eye out for any evidence to the contrary) in an effort to identify the theory’s details and decide upon its philosophical plausibility.

One goal of the seminar is to further develop the student's sense both of what makes an argument a good argument, and of what sorts of conclusions are worth arguing for, in the first place. Another goal is to hone the reading and writing skills needed to personally benefit from some of the greatest intellectual documents world civilization has to offer, both those studied in this seminar as well as those the student may...
encounter down the road. Primarily, though, the aim of this seminar is to transmit the benefits of having one’s contemporary world-view fundamentally challenged by extraordinary, but carefully argued for, alternatives.

It is quite mistaken to think of this as a seminar in the "history of ideas," or as a "survey" seminar: matters of who said what and when are of only instrumental importance to us; and making sure to cover "a little of everything" will not be pursued at the expense of depth. Moreover, while literary interpretive skill is quite helpful to possess for our purposes, the work involved in this seminar has somewhat more in common with the theoretical sciences and mathematics than it has with literature.

**SEMINAR REQUIREMENTS.** In order to receive credit for this seminar, each of the following requirements must be met according to the instructor’s satisfaction. *These requirements are not negotiable.*

1. **Tutorial Papers.** 3 “tutorial” papers (for additional information about tutorial papers see, *Tutorial Papers: Procedures and Guidelines* included in this packet).
   a. Papers are based upon questions about specific readings.
   b. The questions to be answered are set at least ten days in advance.
   c. Papers may not exceed 2 1/2 pages, single-spaced, unless stated otherwise.
   d. **No late papers will be accepted** without prior arrangement having been made with the instructor.
   e. One-hundred percent of each paper must be written by the student receiving credit for it. Any papers that include any amount of plagiarized, or other uncited, material will result in the student being immediately dismissed from the seminar. University expulsion may also apply. Please see the relevant portion of *Tutorial Papers: Procedures and Guidelines*, for further discussion of this policy.

2. **Tutorial Meetings.** 2 “tutorial meetings”. Each of the first two tutorial papers is accompanied by a tutorial meeting, discussed more thoroughly in *Tutorial Papers: Procedures and Guidelines* (included in this packet).
   a. Each meeting lasts 50 minutes, and is arranged near the beginning of the semester.
   b. Meetings include from 2-4 students plus myself.
   c. Portions of 2-3 papers are read aloud and discussed critically.

3. **Reading.** Regular reading
   a. 35-50 difficult → very difficult pages per week.
   b. Physical reading material will be needed by each student for each class meeting. Please plan accordingly. After the first week of class, students without physical reading material will be dismissed from the seminar.
      i. Physical reading material includes either the two required texts listed below, or alternative editions of them. If the student elects to use the free e-texts available on the internet, he or she is still responsible for bringing all the relevant downloaded, printed material to class.
      ii. It will sometimes happen that texts will not be consulted during an entire class period. This does not signify that students are no longer required to continue bringing with them all relevant physical texts.

4. **Attendance.** Very strong class-attendance record
   a. After 5 misses, the student may be disenrolled from the seminar, or be grade-penalized, or lose office visits/paper remarks privileges. Consequences are applied 100% at instructor’s discretion.
      i. There are no “excused” absences. The student’s allotment of 5 misses includes all misses, regardless of circumstances or reasons for the absences. The issue at hand
is not one of apportioning blame or punishment for missing class (as students often mistakenly conclude), but is simply one of ensuring that I can attest that the student has actually taken a 3-credit hour seminar in this subject according to my (the instructor’s) standards.

ii. Instructor does not accept excuse notes from doctors, parents, coaches, other instructors, etc. Please do not submit them to me. They are 100% irrelevant, as ought to be clear given the remarks made in point (i). In the case of students being asked or required by someone else to hand to me such notes (e.g., coaches), the student will simply need to explain to the third party that I simply do not accept them.

iii. The summer session begins on the first official day of class—there is no “grace” period before attendance is officially recorded. This also applies to students who register for the seminar “late”.

b. Instructor is not required to consult with students or to seek their permission to implement any of the above consequences.

5. **E-mail.** Maintain a working email address, check it several times/week, and keep its storage quota below maximum capacity. One main form of communication between us is email, mostly for the exchange of important information and seminar documents. Failure to check email for extended periods of time does not excuse students from having to know certain information or from possessing certain documents. In some cases, messages or documents may contain deadline date information. If you believe that you are not receiving email from me, you must let me know immediately.

6. **Seminar demeanor.** Students will be held to specific standards of decorum in the seminar. Most of the items listed below are little more than what has been normally expected from, and practiced by, college students over the centuries. Nonetheless, recent years have produced a student culture that is incompatible with these expectations, forcing some faculty to make what used to be mere tacit assumptions become explicit requirements. To those of you for whom many of the following items seem too obvious to need mention, I apologize for taking your time with them and thank you for your indulgence. Please note that the final two items concern the in-class use of popular technologies.

   a. Students may not chat with one another during class, silently or otherwise. It is terribly disruptive to both myself and to other students, and compromises the student’s grasp of the seminar material. Also, the point behind there being a seminar component to the seminar, as well as there being a strict attendance policy, is that the student is using that time to make seminar progress. Seminar behavior that interferes with this process, both for myself and for other students, will not be tolerated; seminar behavior that unnecessarily disrupts me while I’m working (i.e., conducting class) will not be tolerated. Students not prepared to make this sort of commitment to the seminar element are quite simply not welcome to stay in the seminar.

   b. Students may not get up to leave part way through class, except for truly urgent reasons. Each class period is 1hr and 15 minutes long. Please plan accordingly.

   c. Students may not simply blurt out remarks in class without having first been given the floor by the instructor. All students must first be recognized by the instructor in order to speak in class. The “method of hands” works best. Although JCU classes are typically much smaller than a number of classes at larger universities, class populations are still too large to afford a more informal atmosphere than we’d all prefer. For a seminar such as this one, 12 students are optimal; typically, though, it is forced to house at least 2½ times this number. Therefore, the class-size is far too large to allow a more informal procedure. (Sorry!)

      i. Student verbal contributions will be distributed amongst the class members as the instructor sees fit. This can only be managed if the instructor is allowed to “direct traffic,” so to speak. This means that it is part of my job not only to call on people, but also to sometimes not call on people who wish to speak.

      ii. Students who fail to observe these procedures will be dismissed from the seminar.
d. **No cell phones or similar devices**—texting devices, peeks, etc.—are allowed in class. Any such electronic devices brought with the student must be out of site and turned OFF prior to class time.

e. **No laptops**, voice recorders (including Livescribe Pulse Pens, and so forth), filming devices (e.g., Flips) or other computer devices, are allowed in class.

f. Reading-dedicated devices, such as a Kindle or Nook, are welcome in class provided that they are the source of your seminar texts.

7. **Form Submission.** Sign and return all relevant seminar forms. Forms not submitted by the 3rd class period will result in the student’s dismissal from the seminar.

   a. These forms include, but are not limited to: your Tutorial Schedule Sheet, and a signed Syllabus/Requirements Read and Receipt Form. Both forms are included in the present packet; any others will be distributed by the instructor.

8. **Final Exam.** There is no “Final Exam” for this seminar.

**TENTATIVE READINGS**

The following tentative list of dialogues (Plato) and lecture notes (Aristotle) will probably be read either in whole or in part:

PLATO: Apology, Crito, Euthydemus, Gorgias, Hippias Minor, Ion, Laches, Lysis, Protagoras, Meno, Republic I, Euthyphro, Euthydemus, Charmides

**BOOKS**

ISBN’s and LCClass. #’s for the books that will be used in class, and which are available at the JCU Bookstore, appear below. Arrangements have been made with the Bookstore to allow for either purchase or rental of these books.


In addition, early translations of Plato have entered the public domain and so are available free-of-charge on the Web. However, students typically find professionally published hardcopies far more convenient to work with than downloads; in addition, some of the Web editions lack Stephanus and Bekker pages, making those editions tremendously difficult to work with. Stephanus and Bekker pages are marginal page numbers, and typically look like this: ‘175b’ or ‘1094a’. Very nearly all textual references in this seminar will use Stephanus and Bekker numbering, so working with texts that include them is imperative.

If you nevertheless choose to use the internet editions, please visit [www.epistemelinks.com](http://www.epistemelinks.com) for access. Then, use the following sequence of choices: PHILOSOPHERS/(PLATO)/ELECTRONIC TEXTS. Among the best of the electronic editions is [www.perseus.tufts.edu](http://www.perseus.tufts.edu).

Students are also welcome to use hardcopy editions other than those listed above. Please be aware, though, that there will be translation differences to work around both in class and in tutorial papers. What is most crucial, though, is that whatever editions you use include Stephanus and Bekker pages.

**Grading Scheme and Policies**
1. **Scheme.** Grading of tutorial papers will use the scale on the next page. Numbers assigned to the letter grades correspond to the typical “grade points” awarded to seminar grades by the University. All papers will receive only one of the “whole” grades (i.e., A, B, C, D, F); intermediate grades (e.g., B+) will arise only as the result of averaging all three papers scores.

2. **Evaluation Criteria.** Tutorial papers will be evaluated largely according to the substantive criteria (as opposed to the items of format) discussed in *Tutorial Papers: Procedures and Guidelines* included in this packet.
   a. **The assignment of all paper grades is final.** The instructor will not “discuss” paper grades with students, “negotiate,” or otherwise reconsider the student’s assigned grade. Any student who is truly qualified to evaluate his or her own work for this seminar is ineligible to receive college credit for it and so will be dismissed from the seminar. Please notice that this policy only concerns the paper’s grade.
   b. Students are encouraged to ask for additional commentary on their graded work beyond what is standardly provided. The aim behind additional commentary is educational, and not grade-related.

3. **Final Grade Calculation.** Each student will have accumulated 3 paper scores by term’s end. The final seminar grade is based upon a simple average of these 3 scores. In some cases, (0.7) is then added to the resulting average. Thus:

\[
\frac{\text{[Sum of 3 tutorial paper scores]}}{3} + 0.7 = \text{Final Seminar Score}
\]

The additional 0.7 is a bonus to help offset some of the effects of my frank and rigorous evaluation of the student’s work. In almost all cases, the bonus improves the student’s grade by two steps (e.g., from B- to B+). However, 0.7 will not be awarded to those students whose final paper is either a D or an F: *Commodum ex iniuria sua nemo habere debet*. This will help to discourage students from mostly neglecting the third paper because they are otherwise satisfied with the grade that they would likely receive. Two illustrations follow.

**Illustration #1:** Suppose that Tutorial Paper No. 1 = 3; second = 1; third = 2. \((\frac{3+1+2}{3}) + 0.7 = 2.7\). This score is between a B and a C. Its corresponding letter grade will be based upon the University grade point assignments (listed below). Thus, 2.7 will be recorded as a ‘B-‘. *There are no “border incidents”—averages must achieve the indicated levels in order to receive those marks.* So, 2.99 is still a ‘B-‘.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>A-</th>
<th>B+</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>B-</th>
<th>C+</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>C-</th>
<th>D+</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Illustration #2:** Suppose that Tutorial Paper No. 1 = 3; second = 2; third = 1. \((\frac{3+2+1}{3}) = 2.0\). This average will be recorded as a C, since the score of the final paper disqualifies the student from the 0.7 bonus.

In virtually all cases, the grade of ‘A’ will rely upon the 0.7 bonus.

---

1. See online version of the *Undergraduate Bulletin*
4. **Challenging Your Final Grade.** The assignment of all seminar grades is final. The instructor will not “discuss” final grades with students, “negotiate,” or otherwise reconsider the student’s assigned grade. Please do not ask to meet with me for this purpose, nor initiate email exchanges for this purpose. In all due respect, no such inquiries will receive substantive replies, except as noted below. Those who nevertheless email me concerning their final grade will have the present portion of the Syllabus printed in any return message. Please remember, too, that you will have signed a sheet verifying that you have received the Syllabus and will abide by all of its policies. There will be no further replies beyond this.

   a. **Exception.** The only exception to this policy, of seminar, is if the student believes that his or her average score has been miscalculated, or that the letter grade submitted by the instructor does not match its corresponding number. These are cases in which I have made a **mistake** in assigning your grade, and I will be eager to correct it.

   i. To notify me of such an error, the student must submit, via email, what the discrepancy is supposed to be (e.g., “My seminar average is in fact 3.0, which is a ‘B’, but I received a ‘B-’”).

   ii. Student must notify me of such an error no later than two weeks following the date on which grades were submitted to the Registrar. (Grades are submitted the Monday immediately following Final Exam week.) After that date, I will no longer consider such claims.

   iii. **Students may, of seminar, ask what their grade is on their last tutorial paper.** Under normal circumstances, the last paper is submitted at such a time that does not allow for communication of this grade prior to the student’s final grade being posted. If you are inquiring about this grade only, please make that clear in your email.

**STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES** (Statement from the University):

“Services for Students with Disabilities (SSD) provides accommodations and support for students with disabilities. Our goal is to provide students with disabilities an equal opportunity to competitively pursue a college education.

Types of Disabilities may include: **Medical/physical** (e.g., cerebral palsy, cancer, traumatic brain injury); **Sensory** (e.g., hearing or visual impairment); **Psychological** (e.g., ADHD, Asperger’s, Depression); **Learning** (e.g., dyslexia, dyscalculia).

*If you would like assistance with accommodations, you must contact Services for Students with Disabilities.* Documentation and verification of disability are required. Specific information regarding documentation and accommodations, as well as other applicable information about SSD and our services, can be found here on our website alternatively, students can contact our office by calling (216) 397-4967.

Students are encouraged to apply for services well in advance of their first semester. An intake appointment with the director is necessary before any accommodations are granted.”

- Located on the Garden Level of the Administration Building, Room A-7
- Phone: (216) 397-4967
- Fax: (216) 397-1820
- E-mail: jsberna@jcu.edu
- Web: www.jcu.edu/disabilities
STATIONARY ON FRAUDULENT WORK AND PLAGIARISM **No fraudulent papers will be accepted.** Students turning them in will be dismissed from the seminar with a failing grade. In addition, there may be University sanctions applied to the student, including expulsion.

A paper is fraudulent if, either: (a) It contains *any* material—no matter how little—that is not a result of the student’s own work. It is acceptable, of seminar, to call the reader’s attention to the thoughts of another. But any such "borrowed" material must either appear in quotes (with appropriate citation), or, if paraphrased, *must nevertheless be introduced as belonging to another* (and with appropriate citation), or, (b) It contains *any* material—no matter how little—the relevance of which the student is unable to adequately explain (even if it is appropriately cited). (c) In order to have their work formally evaluated by the instructor, all students must sign an *Affidavit of Originality* with the submission of each tutorial paper. Normally, students will sign these forms during their tutorial meetings.

**This policy is enforced.** On average, 3 students *per (regular) semester* are dismissed from this seminar on account of submitting fraudulent work. This data is a correct for the period from September, 1995 – August, 2011.

**LETTER WRITING POLICY** Due to the volume of requests for letters of recommendation, my own skepticism about their value to any application process, plus my serious doubt about the relationship between a liberal arts education and certain professions which typically ask students to supply letters, I will only consider requests that meet the following criteria:

1. My primary letter-writing time will be devoted to philosophy majors applying for graduate work in philosophy.
2. . . . Then to philosophy minors applying for graduate work in philosophy.
3. . . . Then to non-philosophy majors and minors applying for graduate work in philosophy.
4. . . . Then to other students applying for graduate work in traditional fields in the liberal arts (English, math, physics, history, etc.).
5. I will NOT write letters for application to law schools, military organizations, or business schools.
6. I will NOT write letters for application for Resident Assistant positions, other campus positions, nor for JCU scholarships, fellowships, etc.

**‘INCOMPLETE’ POLICY** The mark of ‘Incomplete’ (I) is not automatically granted in this seminar. Students wishing to file for a mark of ‘I’ must first secure the instructor’s permission in advance. A grade of ‘F’ will be assigned to students who have not turned in all written work by the final due date unless an ‘I’ has been officially granted.
PL450 SEMINAR MEETINGS AND READING SCHEDULE

Revised: 08/2011

1. It is expected that students will have completed all readings by the specified class dates, quite regardless of what subjects and texts are currently being discussed in class. (That is, there is no such thing as our “getting behind” in the syllabus. Any class period may discuss any and all passages assigned up to, and including, the calendar date in question.) ‘T.B.A.’s’ and changes will be announced in due time. If no announcement is made, then students may suppose that those are “no reading” days.

2. Page numbers refer to Stephanus pages (for Plato) and Bekker pages (for Aristotle), and not to book pages.

3. For every Seminar day after Wednesday, 10/5, “READING” is on a TBA basis.

PL450 Fall, 2011 Calendar

PL450 Fall, 2011 Calendar
Monday, August 29, 2011 – Monday, December 12, 2011
Time zone: (UTC-05:00) Eastern Time (US & Canada)
(Adjusted for Daylight Saving Time)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>August 2011</th>
<th>September 2011</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Su Mo Tu We Th Fr Sa</td>
<td>Su Mo Tu We Th Fr Sa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 8 9 10 11 12 13</td>
<td>4 5 6 7 8 9 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 15 16 17 18 19 20</td>
<td>11 12 13 14 15 16 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 22 23 24 25 26 27</td>
<td>18 19 20 21 22 23 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 29 30 31</td>
<td>25 26 27 28 29 30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Monday, August 29, 2011

**Time**  3:30 PM – 4:45 PM  
**Subject**  PL450A-51 Seminar: Socratic Intellectualism  
**Location**  AD25  

READING: None.

**The Socratic Problem**  
Review of the basic machinery of Socratic Intellectualism
Tuesday, August 30, 2011

**Time** 1:00 PM – 4:00 PM  
**Subject** Dr. Mooney's Office Hours  
**Location** Office: AD B13 (Department of Philosophy)  
**Recurrence** Occurs every Tuesday and Thursday effective 8/30/2011 until 12/8/2011 from 1:00 PM to 4:00 PM

Wednesday, August 31, 2011

**Time** 3:30 PM – 4:45 PM  
**Subject** PL450A-51 Seminar: Socratic Intellectualism  
**Location** AD25  
**READING:** *Ion*  
**Socrates on Meaning and Reference**

Thursday, September 01, 2011

**Time** 1:00 PM – 4:00 PM  
**Subject** Dr. Mooney’s Office Hours  
**Location** Office: AD B13 (Department of Philosophy)  
**Recurrence** Occurs every Tuesday and Thursday effective 8/30/2011 until 12/8/2011 from 1:00 PM to 4:00 PM

Monday, September 05, 2011

**Time** 3:30 PM – 4:45 PM
Tuesday, September 06, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>1:00 PM – 4:00 PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Dr. Mooney’s Office Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Office: AD B13 (Department of Philosophy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurrence</td>
<td>Occurs every Tuesday and Thursday effective 8/30/2011 until 12/8/2011 from 1:00 PM to 4:00 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wednesday, September 07, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>3:30 PM – 4:45 PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>PL450A-51 Seminar: Socratic Intellectualism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>AD25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading</td>
<td>MENO, LACHES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thursday, September 08, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>1:00 PM – 4:00 PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Dr. Mooney’s Office Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Office: AD B13 (Department of Philosophy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurrence</td>
<td>Occurs every Tuesday and Thursday effective 8/30/2011 until 12/8/2011 from 1:00 PM to 4:00 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Monday, September 12, 2011

Time 3:30 PM – 4:45 PM  
Subject PL450A-51 Seminar: Socratic Intellectualism  
Location AD25  
READING: Apology, Gorgias

Tuesday, September 13, 2011

Time 1:00 PM – 4:00 PM  
Subject Dr. Mooney’s Office Hours  
Location Office: AD B13 (Department of Philosophy)  
Recurrence Occurs every Tuesday and Thursday effective 8/30/2011 until 12/8/2011 from 1:00 PM to 4:00 PM

Wednesday, September 14, 2011

Time 3:30 PM – 4:45 PM  
Subject PL450A-51 Seminar: Socratic Intellectualism  
Location AD25  
READING: Republic, Book I.

Thursday, September 15, 2011

Time 1:00 PM – 4:00 PM  
Subject Dr. Mooney’s Office Hours
Location: Office: AD B13 (Department of Philosophy)
Recurrence: Occurs every Tuesday and Thursday effective 8/30/2011 until 12/8/2011 from 1:00 PM to 4:00 PM

Monday, September 19, 2011

Time: 3:30 PM – 4:45 PM
Subject: PL450A-51 Seminar: Socratic Intellectualism
Location: AD25
READING: Euthyphro, Crito

Tuesday, September 20, 2011

Time: 1:00 PM – 4:00 PM
Subject: Dr. Mooney’s Office Hours
Location: Office: AD B13 (Department of Philosophy)
Recurrence: Occurs every Tuesday and Thursday effective 8/30/2011 until 12/8/2011 from 1:00 PM to 4:00 PM

Wednesday, September 21, 2011

Time: 3:30 PM – 4:45 PM
Subject: PL450A-51 Seminar: Socratic Intellectualism
Location: AD25
READING: Hippias Minor

Thursday, September 22, 2011
Monday, September 26, 2011

Time 3:30 PM – 4:45 PM
Subject PL450A-51 Seminar: Socratic Intellectualism
Location AD25
   NO SEMINAR: Tutorial meetings, Round 1.

Tuesday, September 27, 2011

Time 1:00 PM – 4:00 PM
Subject Dr. Mooney’s Office Hours
Location Office: AD B13 (Department of Philosophy)
Recurrence Occurs every Tuesday and Thursday effective 8/30/2011 until 12/8/2011 from 1:00 PM to 4:00 PM

Wednesday, September 28, 2011

Time 3:30 PM – 4:45 PM
Subject PL450A-51 Seminar: Socratic Intellectualism
Location AD25
NO SEMINAR: Tutorial meetings, Round 1.

Thursday, September 29, 2011

- **Time**: 1:00 PM – 4:00 PM
- **Subject**: Dr. Mooney's Office Hours
- **Location**: Office: AD B13 (Department of Philosophy)
- **Recurrence**: Occurs every Tuesday and Thursday effective 8/30/2011 until 12/8/2011 from 1:00 PM to 4:00 PM

Monday, October 03, 2011

- **Time**: 3:30 PM – 4:45 PM
- **Subject**: PL450A-51 Seminar: Socratic Intellectualism
- **Location**: AD25
  
  READING: *Charmides, Protagoras.*

Tuesday, October 04, 2011

- **Time**: 1:00 PM – 4:00 PM
- **Subject**: Dr. Mooney's Office Hours
- **Location**: Office: AD B13 (Department of Philosophy)
- **Recurrence**: Occurs every Tuesday and Thursday effective 8/30/2011 until 12/8/2011 from 1:00 PM to 4:00 PM

Wednesday, October 05, 2011
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:30 PM – 4:45 PM</td>
<td>PL450A-51 Seminar: Socratic Intellectualism</td>
<td>AD25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>READING: <em>Euthydemus</em>.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Thursday, October 06, 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:00 PM – 4:00 PM</td>
<td>Dr. Mooney’s Office Hours</td>
<td>Office: AD B13 (Department of Philosophy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recurrence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Occurs every Tuesday and Thursday effective 8/30/2011 until 12/8/2011 from 1:00 PM to 4:00 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Monday, October 10, 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3:30 PM – 4:45 PM</td>
<td>PL450A-51 Seminar: Socratic Intellectualism</td>
<td>AD25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recurrence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Occurs every Monday and Wednesday effective 8/29/2011 until 12/14/2011 from 3:30 PM to 4:45 PM</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Tuesday, October 11, 2011**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1:00 PM – 4:00 PM</td>
<td>Dr. Mooney’s Office Hours</td>
<td>Office: AD B13 (Department of Philosophy)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recurrence  Occurs every Tuesday and Thursday effective 8/30/2011 until 12/8/2011 from 1:00 PM to 4:00 PM

Wednesday, October 12, 2011

Time  3:30 PM – 4:45 PM
Subject  PL450A-51 Seminar: Socratic Intellectualism
Location  AD25
Recurrence  Occurs every Monday and Wednesday effective 8/29/2011 until 12/14/2011 from 3:30 PM to 4:45 PM

Thursday, October 13, 2011

Time  1:00 PM – 4:00 PM
Subject  Dr. Mooney's Office Hours
Location  Office: AD B13 (Department of Philosophy)
Recurrence  Occurs every Tuesday and Thursday effective 8/30/2011 until 12/8/2011 from 1:00 PM to 4:00 PM

Monday, October 17, 2011

Time  3:30 PM – 4:45 PM
Subject  PL450A-51 Seminar: Socratic Intellectualism
Location  AD25
Recurrence  Occurs every Monday and Wednesday effective 8/29/2011 until 12/14/2011 from 3:30 PM to 4:45 PM
Tuesday, October 18, 2011

- **Time**: 1:00 PM – 4:00 PM
- **Subject**: Dr. Mooney's Office Hours
- **Location**: Office: AD B13 (Department of Philosophy)
- **Recurrence**: Occurs every Tuesday and Thursday effective 8/30/2011 until 12/8/2011 from 1:00 PM to 4:00 PM

Wednesday, October 19, 2011

- **Time**: 3:30 PM – 4:45 PM
- **Subject**: PL450A-51 Seminar: Socratic Intellectualism
- **Location**: AD25
- **Recurrence**: Occurs every Monday and Wednesday effective 8/29/2011 until 12/14/2011 from 3:30 PM to 4:45 PM

Thursday, October 20, 2011

- **Time**: 1:00 PM – 4:00 PM
- **Subject**: Dr. Mooney's Office Hours
- **Location**: Office: AD B13 (Department of Philosophy)
- **Recurrence**: Occurs every Tuesday and Thursday effective 8/30/2011 until 12/8/2011 from 1:00 PM to 4:00 PM

Monday, October 24, 2011

- **Time**: 3:30 PM – 4:45 PM
Subject: PL450A-51 Seminar: Socratic Intellectualism
Location: AD25
Recurrence: Occurs every Monday and Wednesday effective 8/29/2011 until 12/14/2011 from 3:30 PM to 4:45 PM

Tuesday, October 25, 2011

Time: 1:00 PM – 4:00 PM
Subject: Dr. Mooney's Office Hours
Location: Office: AD B13 (Department of Philosophy)
Recurrence: Occurs every Tuesday and Thursday effective 8/30/2011 until 12/8/2011 from 1:00 PM to 4:00 PM

Wednesday, October 26, 2011

Time: 3:30 PM – 4:45 PM
Subject: PL450A-51 Seminar: Socratic Intellectualism
Location: AD25
Recurrence: Occurs every Monday and Wednesday effective 8/29/2011 until 12/14/2011 from 3:30 PM to 4:45 PM

Thursday, October 27, 2011

Time: 1:00 PM – 4:00 PM
Subject: Dr. Mooney's Office Hours
Location: Office: AD B13 (Department of Philosophy)
Recurrence: Occurs every Tuesday and Thursday effective 8/30/2011 until 12/8/2011 from 1:00 PM to 4:00 PM
Monday, October 31, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>3:30 PM – 4:45 PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>PL450A-51 Seminar: Socratic Intellectualism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>AD25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurrence</td>
<td>Occurs every Monday and Wednesday effective 8/29/2011 until 12/14/2011 from 3:30 PM to 4:45 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tuesday, November 01, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>1:00 PM – 4:00 PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>Dr. Mooney’s Office Hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>Office: AD B13 (Department of Philosophy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurrence</td>
<td>Occurs every Tuesday and Thursday effective 8/30/2011 until 12/8/2011 from 1:00 PM to 4:00 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Wednesday, November 02, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>3:30 PM – 4:45 PM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>PL450A-51 Seminar: Socratic Intellectualism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>AD25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recurrence</td>
<td>Occurs every Monday and Wednesday effective 8/29/2011 until 12/14/2011 from 3:30 PM to 4:45 PM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Thursday, November 03, 2011
Monday, November 07, 2011

Time 1:00 PM – 4:00 PM
Subject Dr. Mooney’s Office Hours
Location Office: AD B13 (Department of Philosophy)
Recurrence Occurs every Tuesday and Thursday effective 8/30/2011 until 12/8/2011 from 1:00 PM to 4:00 PM

Wednesday, November 09, 2011

Time 3:30 PM – 4:45 PM
Subject PL450A-51 Seminar: Socratic Intellectualism
Thursday, November 10, 2011

Time: 1:00 PM – 4:00 PM  
Subject: Dr. Mooney's Office Hours  
Location: Office: AD B13 (Department of Philosophy)  
Recurrence: Occurs every Tuesday and Thursday effective 8/30/2011 until 12/8/2011 from 1:00 PM to 4:00 PM

Monday, November 14, 2011

Time: 3:30 PM – 4:45 PM  
Subject: PL450A-51 Seminar: Socratic Intellectualism  
Location: AD25  
Recurrence: Occurs every Monday and Wednesday effective 8/29/2011 until 12/14/2011 from 3:30 PM to 4:45 PM

Tuesday, November 15, 2011

Time: 1:00 PM – 4:00 PM  
Subject: Dr. Mooney's Office Hours  
Location: Office: AD B13 (Department of Philosophy)  
Recurrence: Occurs every Tuesday and Thursday effective 8/30/2011 until 12/8/2011 from 1:00 PM to 4:00 PM
Wednesday, November 16, 2011

Time 3:30 PM – 4:45 PM  
**Subject** PL450A-51 Seminar: Socratic Intellectualism  
**Location** AD25  
**Recurrence** Occurs every Monday and Wednesday effective 8/29/2011 until 12/14/2011 from 3:30 PM to 4:45 PM

Thursday, November 17, 2011

Time 1:00 PM – 4:00 PM  
**Subject** Dr. Mooney’s Office Hours  
**Location** Office: AD B13 (Department of Philosophy)  
**Recurrence** Occurs every Tuesday and Thursday effective 8/30/2011 until 12/8/2011 from 1:00 PM to 4:00 PM

Monday, November 21, 2011

Time 3:30 PM – 4:45 PM  
**Subject** PL450A-51 Seminar: Socratic Intellectualism  
**Location** AD25  
**Recurrence** Occurs every Monday and Wednesday effective 8/29/2011 until 12/14/2011 from 3:30 PM to 4:45 PM

Tuesday, November 22, 2011

Time 1:00 PM – 4:00 PM
Subject: Dr. Mooney’s Office Hours
Location: Office: AD B13 (Department of Philosophy)
Recurrence: Occurs every Tuesday and Thursday effective 8/30/2011 until 12/8/2011 from 1:00 PM to 4:00 PM

Wednesday, November 23, 2011

Time: 3:30 PM – 4:45 PM
Subject: PL450A-51 Seminar: Socratic Intellectualism
Location: AD25
Recurrence: Occurs every Monday and Wednesday effective 8/29/2011 until 12/14/2011 from 3:30 PM to 4:45 PM

Thursday, November 24, 2011

Time: 1:00 PM – 4:00 PM
Subject: Dr. Mooney’s Office Hours
Location: Office: AD B13 (Department of Philosophy)
Recurrence: Occurs every Tuesday and Thursday effective 8/30/2011 until 12/8/2011 from 1:00 PM to 4:00 PM

Monday, November 28, 2011

Time: 3:30 PM – 4:45 PM
Subject: PL450A-51 Seminar: Socratic Intellectualism
Location: AD25
Recurrence: Occurs every Monday and Wednesday effective 8/29/2011 until 12/14/2011 from 3:30 PM to 4:45 PM
Tuesday, November 29, 2011

- **Time**: 1:00 PM – 4:00 PM
- **Subject**: Dr. Mooney's Office Hours
- **Location**: Office: AD B13 (Department of Philosophy)
- **Recurrence**: Occurs every Tuesday and Thursday effective 8/30/2011 until 12/8/2011 from 1:00 PM to 4:00 PM

Wednesday, November 30, 2011

- **Time**: 3:30 PM – 4:45 PM
- **Subject**: PL450A-51 Seminar: Socratic Intellectualism
- **Location**: AD25
- **Recurrence**: Occurs every Monday and Wednesday effective 8/29/2011 until 12/14/2011 from 3:30 PM to 4:45 PM

Thursday, December 01, 2011

- **Time**: 1:00 PM – 4:00 PM
- **Subject**: Dr. Mooney's Office Hours
- **Location**: Office: AD B13 (Department of Philosophy)
- **Recurrence**: Occurs every Tuesday and Thursday effective 8/30/2011 until 12/8/2011 from 1:00 PM to 4:00 PM

Monday, December 05, 2011
Tuesday, December 06, 2011

Time 1:00 PM – 4:00 PM
Subject Dr. Mooney’s Office Hours
Location Office: AD B13 (Department of Philosophy)
Recurrence Occurs every Tuesday and Thursday effective 8/30/2011 until 12/8/2011 from 1:00 PM to 4:00 PM

Wednesday, December 07, 2011

Time 3:30 PM – 4:45 PM
Subject PL450A-51 Seminar: Socratic Intellectualism
Location AD25
Recurrence Occurs every Monday and Wednesday effective 8/29/2011 until 12/14/2011 from 3:30 PM to 4:45 PM

Thursday, December 08, 2011

Time 1:00 PM – 4:00 PM
Subject Dr. Mooney’s Office Hours
**Location**  Office: AD B13 (Department of Philosophy)

**Recurrence**  Occurs every Tuesday and Thursday effective 8/30/2011 until 12/8/2011 from 1:00 PM to 4:00 PM

---

**Monday, December 12, 2011**

**Time**  3:00 PM – 4:50 PM

**Subject**  PL450A-51 Final Exam period

**Location**  AD25

Although there is no final exam for this seminar, students are required to leave this slot open for completion of left-over tutorial meetings, etc. This arrangement for left-over tutorial meetings is non-negotiable; please make arrangements accordingly.
TUTORIAL PAPERS: PROCEDURES AND GUIDELINES

ABOUT TUTORIAL PAPERS

What are tutorial papers? Tutorial papers comprise answers to a series of related questions that are given to the student ahead of time. Tutorial papers are not standard essays—no thesis, body, conclusion format. The questions are normally about specified passages from philosophical texts and prompt the student to make a variety of decisions about what’s going on in the passage. The aim of tutorial papers is for the student to independently develop his or her own interpretation of the selected passages—usually about how a certain philosophical argument is supposed to work—and to make his or her own decisions about the relative merits of the passage.

Tutorial papers are more a record of the student’s thought about the questions and the texts than they are “presentational” papers, such as standard college-level essays. As such, they are written more to be read and discussed, rather than to be submitted-graded-returned (although all those things do happen).

Pedagogically, students tend to develop a deeper philosophical insight about texts and questions when they are tasked to come up with their own positions on things, and then critically discuss what they’ve come up with. The point, then, is not to have memorized a particular view and then demonstrate that one can put it in writing, but for the student to formulate what he or she actually thinks—on his or her own—given the available evidence of the text, plus philosophical smarts. This is how actual philosophers actually work, by the way, and so is a sine qua non in a liberal arts seminar in philosophy.

TUTORIAL PAPER WRITING GUIDELINES

Paper Submission. All papers are to be submitted to me electronically, i.e., as an e-mail attachment, by their due dates and times. No late papers are accepted without my prior approval. Please send papers to me at pmooney@jcu.edu.

If you are using MICROSOFT WORD, 2003, 2007, or 2010, please submit your paper as a “word document” (.doc). If you are using ANY OTHER WORD PROCESSOR please instead submit your paper in “rich text format” (.rtf). This format is made available to you in a “drop-down” box when using the “SAVE AS” command, and affords more trouble-free reading of documents between computers with differing word processors.

Paper Formatting and Page Limits. Please adhere to the following formatting in order to afford easier reading and marking-up of your papers.

- Indicate: Name, seminar, Tutorial No., term anywhere at the top of the first page: (e.g., “Colage Studint, PL210, T1, Sp11”).
- No more than 2½ pages, single-spaced.
- Normal margins.
- Normal size font (10, 11 or 12 for most fonts).
- Include a clearly identifiable question number preceding each of your answers. This ensures that I know what question portions of your paper are supposed to be answering. Often, tutorial questions have several parts. Please indicate the individual answer parts, as well.

Below is a sample of what a portion of a rightly formatted tutorial paper might look like.
Get going on the tutorial questions as soon as possible. Some of the questions will prove quite challenging and so will need a little time to “sit” with you. Also, you can’t know what problems that you will face in answering the questions until you start writing, and so you’ll need to allow yourself plenty of time to work through these problems, and to revise your answers as your thinking progresses. You will normally receive each set of tutorial questions two weeks before your papers are due. (Summer sessions may not be able to meet the two-week advance.)

Work Independently. You are very strongly advised to not work with other students in the seminar, or with anyone else in writing these papers. Please complete this work entirely on your own! Among the aims of this work is the development of the individual student’s own capacities. This aim is far too often thwarted when students work with someone else in answering the tutorial questions. If you find that you’ve hit a roadblock of some kind, and need a bit of a jumpstart, please instead seek help from me. I am in a far better position than anyone else about how to lend the appropriate hand without marring your own development. Success in this seminar depends heavily upon your own development…regardless of where you’re starting from. (In addition, students too often don’t know how to work with one another in such a way as to avoid plagiarism.) In those cases where the student needs considerable help in writing mechanics, they may consult the Writing Center for help. But under no circumstances should that help go beyond writing mechanics (e.g., grammar, paragraph structure, etc.).

Answer the actual questions asked. Past students have often simply neglected the question altogether, choosing instead to discuss some issue related to the question. But there is indeed a difference between answering a question (which you must do), and giving what is merely a general discussion on the question topic (which is not a substitute for answering the question). Answering a question is not the same thing as having something to say when asked a question.

It is rather easy to lose one’s focus in answering difficult questions about deep and complicated philosophical texts. To help avoid this problem, my advice is to answer the question directly, precisely and briefly, first, and then give your explanation, argument or other discussion.

Make sure that your explanation, argument or other discussion really explains, argues for, or otherwise helpfully discusses your initial, brief answer. If it doesn’t, don’t write it. Put a different way, make sure that everything you write does some work towards answering a question, or explaining and defending your answer. If not, the sentence, paragraph, page—or whatever—is philosophically useless and oughtn’t to be written. Be sure to answer all questions, question parts, etc.

Clarity of Writing. In philosophy there is a rather high premium placed upon the clarity of writing. Mostly, this means that you must make every effort to ensure that your readers can readily follow what you are saying, sentence by sentence. Specifically, you will need to pay very close attention to matters of grammar and spelling, and to work for the most efficient organization and presentation of your thoughts that you can manage.
Clarity also requires striving for simplicity. For a variety of reasons, writing philosophy may seem to invite students to use overly complex means of expression in their writing. (No doubt, you have read philosophers that reveal a flair for complexity; but this is not what makes that philosopher great, if he or she is great.) But, unless there is no way out of complexity, avoid it. One consequence of following this advice is that it will demand of you that you rewrite your answers several times (---again: do not wait to get started on the questions).

A final word about mechanics: In general, I will make remarks about grammar, spelling, etc., only in the first paragraph or two, even if the remainder of the paper contains additional mechanical errors. Often, too, I will resort to abbreviations for these sorts of remarks. Far more often than not, mechanical problems make for worse papers—-at least to the extent that the problems interfere with the reader figuring out what you’re trying to say. Your knowing what you mean when you use bad grammar, sloppy spelling, etc., is not a good reason for believing that anyone else will know what you mean. In general, it is expected that all papers will meet high mechanical standards (college-level standards). Very probably, students cannot pass this seminar without being able to meet such standards.

**Tutorial vs. Essay Paper.** The papers you will write for this seminar are tutorial papers, not essay papers. Among other things, this means that it will not be necessary that you answer the tutorial questions as though you were producing one coherent essay—that is, in such a way that your paper shows the relationship between all of your answers. In fact, I discourage you from trying to write your papers in that way: you will find that your page limit is almost too little space to adequately answer the questions, let alone to explain to the reader some grander thesis that ties them together. Instead, I strongly prefer that you simply answer each of the questions “by itself,” and leave the relationship between the answers to be drawn out at a later time. I am convinced that the best way to learn anything about the strengths and weaknesses of various philosophical views is, first, by concentrating your thought upon quite specific passages using the method of question and answer and, second, by discussing what you say about these passages in focused tutorial meetings. For these purposes, the “standard essay” method is an extremely poor instrument, so please avoid it.

**Philosophical Responses to Objections.** Almost all of the tutorial papers will require that the student say how Socrates (or whomever) might respond to certain objections raised against their views. In doing so, however, students find it very tempting to simply restate the philosopher’s view, and then suppose that this is the same as a response to the objection. In philosophy, though, a response to an objection makes the objection “go away,” so to speak, and so is not merely a restatement of the original view.

To make the objection “go away”, one has to show that the objection is either groundless, that it misses the point, that it itself makes false presuppositions or that the original view is somehow able to account for the objection without damaging the theory—or by yet some other means. In any case, a response is no mere digging-in-of-heels, but in one way or another weakens the force of the objection. Your papers will not be devoted to merely setting out two or more opposing views (though this will often be involved), but to actually determining which of two or more opposing views is more likely correct!

**Be honest about your difficulties.** It is often quite tempting to try to write “smooth” answers to tutorial questions—that is, answers which cover up, or gloss over, almost obvious difficulties that your answers face. Philosophy students must avoid this, however. The idea behind writing in philosophy is to be as honest as you can about the difficulties that your answer faces. The best way to find a good answer to a philosophical question, after all, is to be as forthright and clear about what the difficulties are that proposed answers face. So if there are difficulties that your answers face, please be candid about these in your answers! I will, of seminar, be looking for papers that exhibit a strong, concerted effort to provide thoroughly thought-out answers. But it is perfectly consistent with this standard that you openly acknowledge where you are not quite sure of yourself, and why.
Openly challenge Socrates, Plato and Aristotle (or whomever) about their arguments and their philosophical presumptions. Many of the questions will afford you the opportunity to say whether or not you think the philosophers in question are right or wrong about what they say. If you think they are wrong on a certain point, there is no need to be shy in saying so and in saying why you think they are wrong. In fact, go out of your way to be hard on them, if you think it is warranted.

Good arguments and bad arguments. Often, you will need to say whether or not you think that a particular argument is a good or bad argument. What makes an argument good or bad is itself a matter of controversy in philosophy. However, at the very least, a good argument is one in which its conclusion is amply supported by its premises, and the premises are likely to be true. So some reasons for thinking that an argument isn’t very good might include: the premises don’t sufficiently support the conclusion; one or more of the premises are false; and so on. Likewise, the following considerations are not reasons for thinking that an argument is good (I make use of phrases typical of student papers): “It makes sense”, “It got whomever Socrates was speaking with to back down,” “Socrates does a good job of explaining himself,” etc. The criteria for a good argument, in short, are scientific criteria, broadly construed, and not mere rhetorical criteria.

Do not write something just because you think it is what I would agree with or would like to hear. Such a strategy will almost certainly wind up in disaster. You stand a far better chance of doing well on your papers by writing what you yourself think is true, even if you suspect that what you think is quite the contrary of what I think. Also, it is much easier to reason plausibly for a particular philosophical position if you feel sincerely pulled toward that position.

Textual evidence and citations. In answering the questions rely upon the text as much as possible. Do not attribute a view to Socrates, Plato or Aristotle (or whomever) unless you have textual evidence that you can cite which justifies your attributing views to them. Far more often than not the text will tell you—in one way or another—what you need to know. I do not say that the text will tell you this “directly,” for sometimes the only way to figure out what is being said is to develop some instincts for how Socrates, Plato and Aristotle (or whomever) get things across. Nevertheless, you cannot simply dismiss the text.

Make sure to actually cite the textual evidence for your views where appropriate. For example, if you say that Aristotle’s views about voluntary wrongdoing are such and such, you must indicate the passage or passages which support your claim. In Ancient Greek Philosophy (PL210), this is normally done by citing the Stephanus pages and line numbers (Plato), or Bekker pages and line numbers (Aristotle). For all other of my seminars (PL101, PL 270, etc.), use the page numbers of whatever the common text is for the seminar, or paragraph number if the text supplies it (as is the case, say, with Berkeley’s A Treatise Concerning the Principles of Human Understanding).

Cite the textual evidence even if you choose not to directly quote from Plato or Aristotle (or whomever), but merely to paraphrase them. Most scholarly disagreements about what a philosopher’s arguments are for their views arise as the result of a disagreement about what a particular passage is really saying. So you will always need to alert your readers as to the evidence that led you to ascribe a certain view or argument to the philosopher: this way, they may investigate the passage for themselves to see if they agree that what you say is evidence for your interpretation really is evidence for your interpretation.

For our purposes, your citations may be indicated by inserting a parenthetical notation right in the body of your papers. For example: (Meno, 77b4-5), and (De Motu Animalium, 701a1-5). You may abbreviate the names of works in your citations [e.g., the second example above may be indicated as follows: (DMA, 701a1-5).] There is no need for footnotes or bibliographies to catalogue any of this information.
Stay within the bounds of the specified page limit. This limit is partly imposed by the time constraints of tutorial meetings, partly by our common interest in my returning your papers to you in a reasonable amount of time and mostly to force you into improving your writing towards the more concise and on-point. In any case, the questions are designed to fit this limitation with good, clean, concise writing. A few lines or a small paragraph over the page limit is not a problem, but any amount more than that may not be read by me.

No fraudulent papers will be accepted. Students turning them in will be dismissed from the seminar with a failing grade. A paper is fraudulent if either: (a) It contains any material that is not the result of the student’s own work. It is acceptable, of seminar, to call the reader’s attention to the thoughts of another. But any such “borrowed” material must either appear in quotes (with appropriate citation), or, if paraphrased, must nevertheless be introduced as belonging to another (and with appropriate citation), or, (b) It contains any material the relevance of which the student is unable to adequately explain, even if appropriately cited. All papers will require that you sign a statement of originality. Unsigned papers may not be evaluated. Fraudulent papers may also result in expulsion from the University.

TUTORIAL MEETING PROCEDURE

Meeting Structure. Normally, tutorial meetings will include either 2 or 4 students plus myself. (Summer sessions normally include two students/meeting.) Meetings last no more than 50 minutes, unless a longer time is agreed upon by all participants, and will convene according to the meeting schedule arranged with students ahead of time. It is crucial that students arrive on time. The default location for all meetings is the Department of Philosophy Conference Room, just inside the department’s main door, and then an immediate right.

What should each student bring with him or her to the meeting? Students who are readers need to supply each student participant with a copy of his or her paper (including one for yourself). (Normally, all students in a summer session seminar are readers.) I will supply my own copy. All copying will need to be done prior to the meeting’s start.

Non-readers do not need to supply extra copies of their own papers, but should nevertheless have a copy for themselves to use. Everyone will need to have the relevant texts with them (e.g., Plato’s Republic, I).

Readers and Non-Readers. A reader will read out loud various portions of his or her paper during the meeting. Which portions are read is decided by me during the meetings. Normally, there are 2 readers/meeting. The role of non-readers is to carefully observe the proceedings, paying attention to the philosophical give-and-take of the reading participants. Non-readers are encouraged to raise questions with the readers about their answers, just as I will be doing. The roles of reader and non-reader will switch during the second round of meetings.

Meeting Procedure. The two readers each take turns reading their answers to the tutorial questions. I will pick and choose which answers each student will read. Normally, my selections will be made in accordance with what discussions emerge between us, the amount of time available to us, and what issues most interest me at the time. Each reader will be frequently interrupted by me asking them questions about what they wrote (questions of clarification about what the student wrote, questions that get the student to rethink his or her reasoning for a given answer, questions asking about the student’s textual justification for an answer, etc.). The point of my questions is always philosophical and pedagogical: students are not there to prove anything about themselves, or to compete with anyone.

Aim of Meetings. Tutorial meetings are an attempt to do honest, non-artificial scholarly work, which it is at least one aim of any seminar in philosophy to meet. This is best accomplished after each participant has already given deliberate consideration to certain questions, so that they may then discuss them intelligently with other people who have done similar work. (Note that this process is little less than how all sciences
proceed at a certain level.) Figuring out good answers to deep, difficult, questions requires that real preparation be done ahead of time, and then have the results discussed in a sterile environment. Tutorial meetings are among the closest proximity to that aim that college-level education can achieve.

Is the meeting graded? No. Only the papers are. The meetings themselves are strictly educational events and, as such, carry no evaluative threat. The work that will be graded—the papers—have already been written, so the meetings will neither harm nor help any grade prospects. At risk of sounding quaint, the meetings are there strictly for you to learn.

Please remember: Lots of direct and indirect advice is given along the way about how to write answers to these sorts of questions, how to read texts—scour them, really—for philosophical arguments and information. Non-readers are to pay attention to all such remarks no less than readers (even though the remarks are specifically about only their papers). In fact, it is expected that each student’s second tutorial paper will be a better product for those reasons, and it will be graded accordingly. (And so on for T3.)

PAPER EVALUATION AND FEEDBACK

Feedback on your tutorial papers comes in three distinct ways.

Remarks Made in Tutorial Meetings. Remarks both about philosophy and about writing are made during these meetings. While the purpose of the philosophical ones is primarily for the sake of doing philosophy—having a considered, deliberate, discussion about theory—the students should also consider both kinds of remarks as feedback on their written work. In both cases, there will be indirect suggestions made about how this present paper could have achieved its aims better, and about how to proceed differently next time around. While it is true that, in most cases, only two papers in particular are being commented upon in the tutorial meetings, non-readers in the meetings are nevertheless expected to apply what is said to themselves and to their own work.

Evaluation Summary. Instead of returning papers to you, I will return an Evaluation Summary. SEE SAMPLE BELOW. The summary is a brief discussion of your work as a whole, and so doesn’t go into the same level of detail as do those remarks made in tutorial meetings. Many students find that they are better able to benefit from remarks of a more general sort, and are less practiced at benefitting from remarks pitched at a greater level of detail (though see next paragraph).

Solicited Additional Remarks (detail-type comments). Students who desire more feedback on their work—feedback of a more detailed kind—besides the two mentioned above (those made in tutorial, and general remarks in the evaluation summary), may request that of me. Please make such requests within 3 days of receipt of the paper’s Evaluation Summary.

While I am very happy and eager to provide additional feedback, per request, please only make sincere requests. Students asking for additional feedback will not receive a “grade bonus” merely on account of making a feedback request; additional remarks are made with the presumption that the student will in fact read and consider them.
Tutorial Paper Evaluation Summary

Typic L. Stoodint
PL000: Philosophy
Fall, 1820; Core V
Dr. P. J. Mooney

Tutorial No. 1: [Title Here]
Grade: B
What’s superb about your work is your willingness and ability to be hard on Plato, Locke (whomever), and in ways that are almost always philosophically interesting. You are equally able both to present the relevant views, and then to critique them.

Two other thoughts come to mind. One is that you need to work on “formalizing” your writing. As it stands, it’s a bit conversational. That’s not too big a deal, except that the more advanced you get in PL, and the more control you gain over your writing, there is a greater expectation that the writing be more formal (put a higher standard on grammar, paragraph construction, and make what you say accessible to an audience wider than 398A.

The other is you should “expect more” from Plato and Locke (or whomever) than you do. What I mean is that you need more to go out of your way to “make them” right about what they say before launching your critique. Each of P and L, for instance, can defend themselves against you more straightforwardly than you perhaps suppose. So, to get as much from them as possible, and from your efforts at critique, ratchet up a few notches their own smarts at anticipating objections.

Tutorial No. 2: [Title Here]
Grade: C
Here and there you seem to be digging-in productively with Aristotle’s main idea through which assails Plato’s account of the Forms, particularly in your Q2, and a little less so in your later discussion of snub nose. Still, what’s needed is some clear statement and exposition about why Aristotle’s abstracted Universals are OK, and Plato’s abstractions are somehow ‘separated,’ and so objectionable.

On the whole, though, your discussions (and reading?) of the passages are not thorough enough to deal adequately with the subtle business of Aristotelian philosophy. In some places, in fact, you attribute to Aristotle some Platonic views that he openly rejects. My only recommendation in this regard is that you be substantially more deliberate in your reading of the passages and of the questions—appreciating that there is a genuine interpretive puzzle here to solve (the last sentence of the above paragraph), and then committing to the passages to figure it out.

Tutorial No. 3: [Title Here]
Grade: C
Your work here is noticeably stronger than your first paper. Keep going!
Here, then, is the next thing to work on. Your answers aren’t as ontologically informed as they need to be, given the passages. Each of P and A seem to be saying something about the connection between ontology (existence) and poetry—in fact, good poetry—and, on the whole, your answers seem to be skirting past this. Make sure to interpret passages in philosophy according to what philosophical significance they have (in this case, that would be ontological significance). Otherwise, answers tend to come off far more as summaries of passages. But summaries don’t make any philosophical point—they merely present what happens in a passage. Do you see what I’m getting at? (Of seminar, sometimes you need to do a summary to get to the philosophical point; and sometimes my questions explicitly instruct you to make sure to present an argument—which is a sort of summary. But, the summary itself is not the point.)
TUTORIAL SCHEDULE SHEET

Place an ‘X’ in those cells during which you absolutely cannot meet. Place a ‘1’ in any and all cells during which you prefer to meet. You may have as many 1’s as you like. Leave all other cells open (these are times during which you can meet, but they aren’t your preferred times). Note that some cells have already been x-ed out by me. I will use this information in scheduling both of your tutorial meetings for the Term. If any of your information changes, you may so notify me by filling out the form again and resubmitting it to me.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Monday</th>
<th>Tuesday</th>
<th>Wednesday</th>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7:00am</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00am</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00am</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00am</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00am</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00pm</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1:00pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2:00pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3:00pm</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4:00pm</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5:00pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6:00pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7:00pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8:00pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:00pm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
STUDENT RECEIPT-AND-READ OF SEMINAR SYLLABUS

By signing below, the named student confirms having received the Seminar Syllabus for PL450-51 (Socratic Intellectualism); understands all of what is required of him or her in order to receive credit for the seminar; understands all seminar policies associated with how the seminar is conducted; and agrees to abide by all requirements and policies.

________________________________________
Student Signature

________________________________________
Print Name

________________________________________
Date