

**Paper Topics**  
**PHIL 1101/1801**  
**Fall 2010**

**Directions:** Choose one of the following topics and write a 3-4 page paper on it. (Note: this means that you should get onto the fourth page but not off the fifth). The paper should be double-spaced, and it should be formatted in 12 point font with one inch margins all around. You should avoid quotations from the text. You must rely solely on primary sources for this paper.

**Due Date:** The paper must be emailed to me as an attachment by Friday, December 10 at 5:00 PM. (mcollier@morris.umn.edu). The paper should be formatted as either a Word or PDF document. I will confirm receipt of the paper by email. You should make sure to save a copy of the paper in case there are any problems. Papers turned in between 5:00 PM and midnight on December 10 will be deducted half a letter grade. After that point, papers will be deducted a full grade each day they are late.

1. What is the strongest objection that Philo raises against Cleanthes' Design Argument? How might Cleanthes try to respond to this objection? Would this reply be adequate? Why or why not?

2. Explain and evaluate Demea's *a priori* argument on pp. 54-55. What is the strongest objection that can be raised to it? How might Demea try to respond? Would Demea's reply be adequate? Why or why not? (Note: You can use one of the objections raised by Cleanthes on pp. 55-56 in the evaluation phase of your paper, although you need not do so).

3. Explain and evaluate Hume's *a priori* argument against miracle testimony on pp. 107-112. What is the strongest objection that proponents of revealed religion might offer? How might Hume attempt to respond? Would his reply be adequate? Why or why not?

**Reminder:** There are two main parts of a philosophy paper: the first involves an *interpretation* of the structure of the argument; the second involves an *evaluation* of the argument. In the first (interpretative) part of the paper should present your reconstruction of the argument in question; the goal is to put the argument as elegantly and simply as possible, while not oversimplifying it. The second (evaluative) part should include two separate parts: (a) you should pose the strongest possible objection to the argument and then (b) consider whether the philosopher has the resources with which to adequately reply to it.