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Personnel

A) The Chairperson oversees the Department. Appointment to this office is made by the Dean of Arts and Sciences on the basis of faculty election. The term is three years.

B) The Assistant Chairperson oversees semester scheduling, teaching workshops and advising the student teaching assistants and lecturers.

C) The Director of Graduate Studies oversees admissions, financial aid, course registration approvals, and other miscellaneous matters concerning graduate students. Appointment for a two-year term is made by the Executive Committee of the Department.

D) The Assistant to the Chair handles matters concerning the faculty, financial affairs and other matters assigned by the Chair.

E) The Administrative Secretary handles most of the paperwork and records of graduate students in the department, as well as a wide variety of other tasks.

F) The Executive Committee is responsible for many administrative decisions in the department. It comprises the Chair, ex officio, and four persons elected by the Department. Elected members serve for a two-year term.

Registration

All degree-seeking students are required to be registered for something every fall and spring term from the time they are admitted to degree status until they graduate. If a student does not register for anything for a term, the student will be automatically dropped from the program by the Graduate School. Students are considered to be full-time if they take 7 credits or more, half-time if they take 4-6 credits, or less than half-time if they take less than 4 credits. TAs, RAs, and students on fellowships need to be full-time, as well as some international students according to their visa specifications. The status of being full-time and half-time allows students, among other things, to defer and make federal student loans. Students earn credits by registering for coursework, thesis, or dissertation credits; by registering for the continuation courses; or by registering for a combination of these.

The following are things students might register for:

1. Course work. MA Students are expected to earn 24 credits and 6 thesis credits for the specialization in the history of philosophy Plan A. Students in the MA History of Philosophy Plan B and in the SOAP program are expected to earn 30 credits. PhD students are expected to earn 60 credits of course work (Of these, as many as 30 may be transferred from an MA program). Although philosophy courses from Marquette are the most obvious choices, courses from other departments or institutions might be appropriate. Students should discuss these possibilities with their advisers. TAs, RAs, and students on fellowships, who need to be full-time and who register only for two
courses (6 credits), will keep full-time status either by registering for Dissertation Credits (Phil 8999) (if they are already well advanced in the program; see 3 below) or by enrolling in Phil 9974, 9975, or 9976 by filling in the form “Graduate Asssitsanship/Fellowship Continuation Approval Form.” It is a zero-credit course with a $100 fee.

2. Foreign Language Courses.
For students in the MA program Plan B there are no foreign language requirements.
Students in the MA program Plan A (with thesis) must have reading knowledge of French or German or another foreign language approved by the department.
Students in the PhD program need to demonstrate a reading knowledge of two languages. The regular choices are French or German and either French, German, Latin, or Greek for the second requirement. Another foreign language may be substituted, if necessary to the student’s course of study and approved by the Department.
These language requirements can be satisfied in different ways:
a) Students can take a three-credit course offered by the department of Foreign Languages and Literatures. The tuition will be charged at the normal Graduate School tuition rate and the language credits will be in addition to the regular course credits required for the program. The grade earned will be included in the student term as well as in the cumulative credits and grade point average. Students who are TA/GA/RAAs will have funds to cover the course credited to their accounts by the graduate school. TA/GA/RA students may only take each language course once, and there is a maximum of two that will be funded. (That is, you can take, say, Latin once and French once, but not French twice). The course grade will appear on your transcript.
b) Students can opt to take a two-hour exam administered by the department of Foreign Languages and Literatures. The student must register for the exam and a $100 fee is charged. In order to prepare students for the language exams we often run reading groups in the department. They need to be treated seriously to be effective.

3. Dissertation Credits (Phil 8999). Every PhD student is responsible for taking 12 dissertation credits. They are billed like any other credits. These may be taken at any time in the program, but usually not during the first year. Students who receive financial aid may want to register for these dissertation credits while on aid. However, if these dissertation credits are taken before working on the dissertation and the student decides to withdraw from the program or is withdrawn from the program, there will be no refund. As a rule of thumb, if you receive 9 credits of tuition aid while working as a TA, and only take 2 courses (6 credits) you should also enroll for 3 credits of 8999.

4. Continuation courses.
Students who have finished their course work will keep their status active by registering for continuation courses. These zero-credit courses are linked to the students’ progress in the program and are graded as Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory. Continuation Courses generate a tuition or fee that is currently $100 per semester; the fee is the same regardless of the course that is taken (full-time, half-time, or less than half-time). The status must be justified by the amount of academic work that is being done.
Here are the different options:

4.1 If they have not yet passed the comprehensive exams and are thus not advanced to candidacy, students can register for a Master’s Comprehensive Exam Preparation (Phil 9984, 9985, or 9986) or a Doctoral Comprehensive Exam Preparation (Phil 9987, 9988, or 9989), depending on their degree and depending on the status they can have (full-time, half-time, or less than half-time). They will fill in the “Comprehensive Examination Preparation Continuation Approval” form. This course can only be taken once.

4.2 If they have already taken the Comprehensive Exam Preparation course, but have not yet passed the comprehensive examinations (because they failed or because they postponed taking the exams), they have to register for the Graduate Standing Continuation course (Phil 9970) and fill in the “Graduate Standing Continuation Approval” form. It gives a less than half-time status and cannot be taken with other courses. As such, it will not make the student eligible for student loans and will not defer student loans. It will simply keep the student active as a graduate student.

4.3 For students who are advanced to candidacy (have finished course work, satisfied language and residency requirements, and passed the comprehensive examinations) and are working on their dissertation outline or the dissertation, they register for Doctoral Dissertation Continuation courses (Phil 9997, 9998, or 9999) and fill in the “Dissertation/Thesis/Professional Project Continuation Approval” form. These Doctoral Dissertation Continuation courses may not be taken until all 12 dissertation credits have been taken.

4.4 If, for reasons approved by the department and the Graduate School, a student cannot do academic work during a semester, but wants to remain active as a graduate student, the student will register for the Graduate Standing Continuation course (Phil 9970) and fill in the “Graduate Standing Continuation Approval” form.

Note on Continuous Enrollment.
It is a method of keeping track of the fact that students are often engaged in working toward a degree in ways other than course work. e.g., writing a proposal or preparing for comps. It maintains your connection to Marquette, allowing you to use the library and e-mail, for example. The University is required by federal regulations to assure the government that all students are actually doing productive work, and not merely avoiding repaying loans. Therefore advisers are required to sign a report at the end of each semester confirming progress (and sign the appropriate registration request form at the time of registration) and the DGS submits a grade for continuation courses at the end of the semester. So, for example, if you pass the comprehensive exams and start writing your dissertation, but then take an adjunct job that takes all your time, the government regards that as working, not studying. You always need consent to have continuous enrollment status, and it is graded Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory depending on your progress.

*If you are not taking courses and do not sign up for continuous enrollment, you will be regarded as having voluntarily dropped from the program. It is thus important to maintain your status.*
IN SUM:
In order to register you need to follow these steps: (a) fill in the appropriate form for the courses you want to take; (b) meet with your adviser who will sign the form; (c) on the basis of this form the DGS will issue you a permission number that will allow you to register for the class.

Advising

We have usually chosen as your advisor someone with more or less the same interests as you. You should discuss with your advisor general issues concerning your status and progress in the program, courses that would be good for you to take, gripes or difficulties you are encountering here, etc. Students are responsible for meeting with their advisers regularly and are responsible for the choices they make. Advisers cannot give financial or visa advice. You are responsible for making sure that you comply with any government loan terms or visa requirements. There are resources available to help you, such as the office of financial aid, or the office of international education.

Here are some recommendations:

1) Make sure you know who is your advisor. Look on Checkmarq if you don’t know.

2) Make an appointment to come in for advising during registration time and have the forms filled in. It is especially critical for students taking courses to register for each of their courses promptly. Courses with insufficient students registered at the close of early registration are canceled by the department. Unregistered students are considered to have voluntarily withdrawn by the graduate school. You may be faced with having to re-apply both to the graduate school and the department.

3) If you are a first-year student, there is some special paperwork to take care of.

   a) Are you already coming here with some graduate credits? As many as 30 credits of philosophy can go towards the doctorate; as many as 12 credits in some other subject. But it is incumbent upon you to request that these credits be transferred. You can do this by filing a doctoral program planning form (See below).

   b) By the end of the first year you need to fill out a “Doctoral Program Planning Form” (DPPF). A blank form can be printed out from http://www.grad.mu.edu/forms/downloads/doctplan.pdf

   This requires consultation with your advisor, and his or her signature.

   After your meeting with your advisor, you will bring the completed and signed DPPF to the Director of Graduate Studies.

4) If you are not new, you should have a look at the most recent DPPF on file and see if there are
any changes to the timetable that are serious enough to impact the anticipated date of the degree. If there are, then you need to fill out an amendment to the DPPF, at

http://www.grad.mu.edu/forms/downloads/dppfamend.pdf

and proceed as above

5) Following your meeting with your advisor you should plan to meet with the Director of Graduate Studies. At this meeting you will finalize paperwork. The Director of Graduate Studies will need to give you the permission numbers for classes for which you will be registering. Once you have these numbers, you can register for classes. Please do this in a timely manner. We limit class size and some classes may fill out rapidly.

6) If you have any questions about the advising and registration process, please do not hesitate to ask the Director of Graduate Studies.

Residency requirement
This requirement is intended to immerse graduate students in the intellectual life of the campus community. There are two ways this requirement can be satisfied: (1) the student completes 9 credits of course work, or its equivalent per term, for two terms within an 18-month period (for example 3 courses in the Spring and 3 courses in the Fall of the same year); or (2) the student completes at least 6 credits of course work, or its equivalent per term, for three terms within an 18-month period (for example, 2 courses in the Fall, 2 courses in the following Spring and 2 courses in the following Fall). Plans for satisfying the residency requirement must be stated on the Doctoral Program Planning Form.

Financial Aid
All students must register to request financial aid on the financial aid form available from the Graduate School web site. Even students currently on aid lines must register.

Academic Review
The Philosophy Department evaluates the academic performance of its graduate students at the close of each term. Graduate students must maintain a grade point average of at least 3.00 in all course work, including prerequisites and other course work that does not apply to the degree. Satisfactory academic work is not, however, determined exclusively by course grades. All degree graduate students, including those registered in Continuous Enrollment courses, must make substantial and visible progress toward their degrees. All students in professional or clinical settings must maintain fully professional behavior at all times. If, in the judgment of the department, a student is not doing satisfactory work, either a warning letter will be issued by the department to the student or a recommendation will be made to the Vice Provost for Research and Dean of the Graduate School that the student be dropped from the graduate program. Examples of unsatisfactory work include, but are not limited to: 1) any difficulty maintaining the required 3.00 grade point average, such as a weak first or second term, multiple incompletes, accumulating three Cs (nine hours) or a combination of four BCs and Cs (12 hours), or one grade
of F or U; 2) a term without substantial and visible progress toward completion of program requirements, such as a language examination, a comprehensive or qualifying examination, a thesis or dissertation outline, the thesis or dissertation itself, and so on; 3) unprofessional behavior in laboratory or clinical settings.

**Time Limit and Extension**

The Graduate School policy is that all work for a Ph.D. must be completed within 6 years. This is a serious deadline. If the work has not be completed within the 6 years allocated, students have to request an extension and explain in a letter why the work could not be completed within 6 years and how it will be completed with the extension. If six years have passed and students have not been granted an extension they may be dropped from the program. The final decision in matters of extension lies with the Graduate School.

**Procedure for Requesting an 'I' Grade in a Graduate Course**

The purpose of establishing this procedure is to discourage taking 'I' grades in graduate courses. The following procedure should be followed in any request for an 'I' grade. Permission for a grade of “I” must be obtained before the completion of the course from both the Director of Graduate Studies and the professor teaching the course for which the grade is sought. First, then, the student must present the request for an 'I' grade to the Director of Graduate Studies who will then consult with the professor involved and give a recommendation. Second, the student must then receive permission from the professor to take the 'I' grade. The final decision on the 'I' grade remains with the professor.

The graduate school imposes strict time limits on ‘I’ grades. If you fail to remove an incomplete by the limit imposed by the graduate school, you will forfeit that course, receive no credits and have to pay to re-take it. Thus it is your responsibility to clear any ‘I’ grades by the posted deadline.

**Student Procedures for Contesting Philosophy Grades Considered Unjust**

1. Any student may at any time consult the teacher about the grades received for work done. The exercise of this right neither requires a fixed procedure nor is it subject to procedural conditions.
2. Grades that may be contested under these procedures are any final grade in a course, provided this action is initiated before the calendar date fixed for the removal of the X and I grades.
3. The student must first consult the teacher to find out the teacher’s reasons for the grade. When there are special circumstances that make this first step inadvisable, the chair of the department (or the chair’s delegate) shall be judge of the inadvisability of making this first step.
4. Where the student is not satisfied with the reasons given by the teacher or where the student has acceptable reasons for not seeing the teacher first, the student will present his case in writing to the chair of the department (or delegate). The student should present what graded work he/she has and may request that the final exam be supplied by the teacher.
5. Where the chair (or delegate) and one other faculty member, after consulting with the teacher
about the disputed grade, find no ground for the charge of injustice, the chair (or delegate) must inform the student that no further departmental action is possible.

6. Where there is some color of injustice, the chair (or delegate) shall appoint a committee of three regular members of the department not including the teacher who assigned the contested grade. The chair (or delegate) may appoint himself to such a committee, whose membership is privileged information.

7. The committee may proceed from written evidence or may consult the teacher and/or the student according to its judgment of what is necessary in a given case.

8. The committee (through the chair) shall give one of three decisions: a) that the grade given was just and that the grade will stand; b) that the teacher reconsider the grade in the light of what the committee has discovered and that the teacher’s reconsidered grade will stand; c) that the committee give a departmental grade that it considers just and that this be indicated on the official record of the student as a departmental grade.

9. The review and determination of the appeal shall be completed within 3 weeks of the initiation of the appeal.

10. The decision of the committee shall be the final action inside the department and any appeal beyond the department is made to the Dean of the student’s college. September 1974.

**Requirements for M.A. Programs**

1. **MA in the History of Philosophy:**
   **Plan A:** Thesis option – Please see the Director of Graduate Studies if you want to follow this track.
   **Plan B:**
   1. 30 hours graduate course work. 18 of these must be in philosophy and must include:
      - Plato or Aristotle (Phil 6605 or 6610)
      - Augustine or Aquinas (Phil 6620 or 6640)
      - Descartes, Hume, Kant or Hegel (Phil 6650, 6655, 6660, 6662) and
      - a fourth course in the history of philosophy to be approved by the DGS.
      - a course in ethics
   2. Understanding of the fundamentals of predicate logic
   3. MA Comprehensive Examination
   4. Grade point average of 3.0

   1. 30 hours graduate course work. These credits must include:
      - History and Theory of Ethics (Phil 6310), Seminar in Applied/Professional Philosophy (Phil 6960)
      - one of Plato (Phil 6605), Aristotle (Phil 6610), Augustine (Phil 6620), or St. Thomas Aquinas (Phil 6640)
      - one of Descartes (Phil 6650), Post-Cartesian Rationalism (Phil 6652) Kant (Phil 6660), or Hegel (Phil 6662)
      - two philosophy electives
- a Practicum (Phil 6965) for 6 credits or for three credits plus one more philosophy course
- two graduate level cognate courses

2. Understanding of the fundamentals of predicate logic
3. Grade point average of 3.0.

**Explanation of Requirements for M.A. Programs**

A. Foreign Languages (MA - History Plan A, with Master’s Thesis): Students must have reading knowledge of French or German or another foreign language approved by the department. See above.

There are no language requirements for the MA in the history of philosophy Plan B and for the MA in Social and Applied Philosophy.

B. Fundamentals of predicate logic (MA – History Plan A and B and MA SOAP): students must display an understanding of predicate logic either by course work or by a department exam.

C. Courses outside of Philosophy especially appropriate for the SOAP major might include: Human Resources Management, Legal Issues in Business, Multicultural Counseling, Human Growth and Development, Dispute Resolution Theory, Jurisprudence, Ethics in Health Care, Research Seminar in Political Philosophy, Urban Policy, Moral Theology, and Clinical Topics in Bioethics. These must have the approval of the Director of Graduate Studies.

C. MA Comprehensive Exam (MA in History Plan A and B): The exam comprises two parts of four hours each. The first part is historical. The second contains problems questions and a choice of two questions on a contemporary work.

1. The Structure of the M.A. Comprehensive Exam

   a. **Part I - Ancient, Medieval, Modern**

      Instructions: Answer four questions:

      i. Choose one question from each period and the fourth question from any of the periods.
      ii. You have four hours for Part I, approximately one hour for each question.
      iii. State what you take the question to mean, and make explicit reference to the relevant work(s) of the philosopher you are discussing.

      Ancient Philosophy: 4 questions
      Medieval Philosophy: 4 questions
      Modern Philosophy: 4 questions

   b. **Part II - Problems and Contemporary Philosophy**

      i. You must choose three questions from section D and one question from section E.
      ii. You have four hours for Part II, approximately one hour for each question.

      Problems: (answer any 3 of these questions)

      Logic
      Philosophy of Science
Political Philosophy  
Aesthetics  
Ethics  
Philosophy of Human Nature  
Metaphysics  
Epistemology  
Philosophy of Law  
Philosophy of Religion  

Contemporary Philosophy: (Work chosen by student from designated reading list) Answer one of these 2 questions.

2. Grading System for the M.A. Comprehensive Exam:
   a. The grades to be assigned to each answer by the reader are: A, B, C, D (with or without pluses or minuses), or F.
   b. For purposes of computing an average grade, the graduate committee will then turn the assigned letter grades into numbers: A+=12, A=11, A-=10, B+=9, B=8, B-=7, C+=6, C=5, C-=4, D+=3, D=2, D-=1, F=0

The lowest passing average grade for the entire exam is 6.5, i.e., between C+ (6) and B- (7).
If three questions receive an F, then the whole exam fails no matter what the average grade is.
If the average grade in one area of the exam is D- (1) or F (0), this area must be taken over again and can be passed with the grade of 6.5.

Requirements for Ph.D. Program
A. 60 hours graduate course work plus 12 credits (Phil 8999). These credits must include:
   - Plato or Aristotle (Phil 6605 or 6610)
   - Augustine or Aquinas (Phil 6620 or 6640)
   - Descartes, Hume, Kant or Hegel (Phil 6650, 6655, 6660, 6662) and
   - A fourth course in the history of philosophy to be approved by the Director of Graduate Studies (DGS).

The 60 hours may include up to 30 hours of philosophy credits from an MA degree or up to 12 hours in other fields, as approved by the Department.
B. A reading knowledge of two languages. The regular choices are French or German and either French, German, Latin, or Greek for the second requirement. Another foreign language may be substituted, if necessary to the student’s course of study and approved by the Department.
C. An understanding of the fundamentals of predicate logic demonstrated either by course work or by a department exam.
D. Doctoral Qualifying Examination and Advancement to Candidacy
F. Grade point average of 3.0

G. Residency requirements (See above)

**Explanation of Requirements for Ph.D. Program**

A. 60 credits of course work - 20 classes. They may include up to 30 hours of philosophy credits from an MA degree or up to 12 hours in other fields, as approved by the Department.

B. PHIL 8999 Dissertation credits (See above).

C. Foreign Languages: See above

D. Doctoral Qualifying Examination: Ph.D. Comprehensive Examination

The Purpose of the Examination: To ascertain whether and to what extent the student (1) has mastered the various areas of the history of philosophy and its problems and (2) has developed a scholarly and integrated stance on some of the main problems in philosophy.

E. Advancement to Candidacy:

Students are advanced to candidacy on the recommendation of the Department. They must have completed all course work, language requirements, residency requirements, and passed the DQE. A student cannot advance to candidacy until all requirements, as listed on the **Doctoral Program Planning Form** have been completed.

F. Dissertation (See Additional Information on the Dissertation below)

1. The Proposal

Work on the proposal is now regarded as part of your dissertation project, and so will be covered by continuous enrollment status.

   a. The student finds a faculty member willing to work with him or her on a dissertation in a given area.

   b. The student and director delimit the topic to a precise problem. They discuss provisional names of second readers and other members of the committee. The student may at this point discuss his or her provisional plans with the provisional committee members.

   c. The student reviews the published results of work already done on the topic.

   d. The student and the Director agree on the sources, primary and secondary, to be used.

   e. The student writes a proposal, following the Graduate School guidelines.

   f. Once the proposal is acceptable to the director, the student talks to the Director of Graduate Studies to see which faculty members are available to sit on the committee. Committees have four faculty members.

   g. The student asks faculty members to sit on the committee. The faculty members read the proposal, and if they are still willing to work on the project, a defense of the proposal is set up.

   h. At the meeting, faculty members may ask for revisions of the proposal. Note that this is an important meeting, since all parties involved with the dissertation are signing an agreement concerning the contents of the dissertation. Among the issues to be considered are: whether the student is prepared to read the primary texts in the original languages, any deficiencies in the bibliography, the extent to which the student will be expected to consult the works in the
bibliography, whether the thesis to be defended is clearly stated in the proposal, whether the methodology for defending the thesis is clearly stated in the proposal, whether a page limit should be established for the dissertation, whether the dissertation, as proposed, can be completed in a reasonable time period.

i. Once all members agree to sign off, the proposal is given to the Director of Graduate Studies. He or she reviews the document, asks for any necessary revisions, signs off on the proposal and forwards the proposal to the Graduate School. It is the Graduate School that ultimately accepts the proposal.

2. The Dissertation is then written under the direction of the director and the second reader.

3. The Defense: Once the director and second reader agree that the dissertation is defensible, the dissertation is ready to go to the full committee, and the 60 day clock may be started. The departmental procedure the student follows is: A) Submit 4 copies of the dissertation to the Director. He or she will attach a form that he or she and the second reader sign. This form lets the other committee members know that the dissertation is, in their opinions, ready for defense. The form must have a projected defense date that is at least 60 days from the date the dissertation is distributed to committee members. The date selected for the defense should fit the teaching and research schedules of the committee members. The committee members have 30 days to read the dissertation. B) This date should be provided to the Assistant to the Chair. The department secretary will schedule a room for the defense. The Assistant to the Chair prepares the “Announcement for the Public Defense of the Dissertation.” This form must contain the EXACT title of the dissertation and the time and date of the defense. All committee members must sign the Public Announcement form at least 30 days prior to the defense. C) The student must deliver the dissertation defense program (outlined in the Graduate School Guidelines) to the department at least 30 days prior to the defense. The student should request that the Office staff deliver it and the “Public Announcement” to the Graduate School. D) After a successful defense (and the incorporation of any necessary changes to the dissertation), the student provides an electronic copy of the dissertation to the Graduate School and one hard copy to the Department. The student should check with the Graduate School for the exact requirements for submitting the final dissertation, as well as any associated fees.

G. The student’s cumulative GPA must conform to the requirements of the Graduate School. These are as follows:

**Grading System**

The following letter grades and their achievement equivalents are used by instructors in the Graduate School to evaluate a student’s performance in a course. Quality points corresponding to each letter grade determine a student’s academic average and eligibility to graduate. Each grade, A through F, has a specific quality point value. The quality points earned in any course equal the quality point value of the grade multiplied by the number of semester hours credited. The grade point average (G.P.A.) is found by dividing the total quality points earned by the total number of semester hours credited in those courses for which quality point grades have been assigned. Note: Credits that are accepted for a Marquette degree, if transferred from another university, will not be included when calculating the student’s G.P.A.

All graduate students must maintain a grade point average of at least 3.00 to graduate. (For the effect of BC, C, F, UW and U grades, refer to Academic Review.) Graduate students may not be assigned a CD or a D grade in any course whatsoever, including undergraduate courses.
Normally, graduate courses are not repeated for a higher grade.

Grade Achievement Quality Points
A Excellent 4.00
AB 3.50
B Satisfactory 3.00
BC 2.50
C Minimally acceptable on a limited basis for graduate credit 2.00
CD Not approved for graduate students
D Not approved for graduate students
F Failure 0

Quality points are not affected by the following grades:
W Withdrawal (before withdrawal deadline)*
UW Unexcused Withdrawal
S/U Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory**
CR Completed Requirement of enrollment in a course that carries no credit
Au Audit***
I Incomplete
X Missed Examination
IX Both Incomplete and Missed Examination

A QPA of 3.00 or better is required to graduate.

Additional Information Concerning the Ph.D. Comprehensive Exam

General Structure of the Examination: The exam will consist of five parts, four of which are to be written and the remaining one oral. It is offered twice a year, in August and January. Starting in fall 2008, students may sign up for parts 1 and 2 only, or the whole exam. That is, you may take the historical sections separately, and then take the systematic and oral exam the next time it is offered. Parts 1 and 2 have to be taken before 3, 4 and 5. Each part is graded by a committee of three faculty members. Student exams are provided to graders without identifying information.

The Structure of the Ph.D. Comprehensive Exam
A. Written: A three-hour examination on each part according to the following schedule:
   1. Problems in Ancient and Medieval Philosophy: four questions in each area (total of 8); four questions must be answered, including at least one from each problem area.
   2. Problems in Modern and Contemporary Philosophy: same as in part 1.

   The Examining Committees for parts I and II will construct their respective parts of the written examination from the Ph.D. Reading list in the history of philosophy. [Note that
the history of philosophy reading list is required, the systematic reading list is recommended.

3. Systematic Problems: Metaphysics, Epistemology, Logic and Philosophy of Science: **four questions in metaphysics**, three in epistemology, **and two in philosophy of science/logic** (total of 9); the examinee must answer four questions, including at least one from metaphysics and at least one from epistemology.

4. Systematic Problems: Ethics, Social and Political philosophy, Aesthetics: four questions in ethics, three in social and political philosophy, and two in aesthetics (total of 9); four questions are to be answered, including at least two from ethics and one from either of the remaining areas.

B. Oral: A 50-75 minute examination before a three-person Examining Committee. This is part V of the Comprehensive Exam. It will be graded in the same manner as the four written parts, that is, as a single independent component of the Comprehensive Exam.

At the time a candidate signs up for the PhD comprehensive examination, the candidate must consult with the Director of the Graduate Program to receive approval by the Director for his or her choice of area(s) for the oral part [part V] of the exam. The committee for the oral examination will ordinarily be the committee that graded the written part that is within the area of specialization chosen by the candidate for the oral. For example, if a candidate chooses Ancient Philosophy as his or her area to be examined on the oral, then the Problems in Ancient and Medieval Committee [part I] will conduct the oral examination. The Graduate Director may appoint a separate committee for the oral if the Director believes none of the four committees in place for the written exam is appropriate to question the candidate for the oral given the candidate's approved area(s) of choice. **Questions will be restricted to the chosen area(s).** During the actual exam it will be the responsibility of the committee chair to determine the appropriateness of questions.

**Additional Regulations and Guidelines concerning the Ph.D. Comprehensive Exam**

The examinee **must** have completed 80% of his/her course work and must have fulfilled both language requirements before attempting the Comprehensive Examination. All Ph.D. students should take the Comprehensive Exam no later than the end of the semester following the completion of their course work and foreign languages.

The Comprehensive Examination will be offered twice a year, in August and January. Students who wish to take the exam must sign up at the Philosophy Department office at least one month before the date of the initial part of the exam. Each committee for all five parts will consist of three persons.

The written parts of the examination must be completed within a twelve-day period. Parts I and II will be taken the first week. Parts III and IV will be taken the second week. The time, date, and room for parts I-IV will be posted at least 28 days before the date for part I. Ordinarily, there will be at least a five-day interval between the first two parts of the exam and parts three and four. The fifth (oral) part must be taken no later than 14 days following completion of part four. The results of the oral (part five) will be given to the examinee following its completion.

The examinee must pass all parts to pass the Comprehensive Examination. A mean grade of BC [2.50 on a 4.0 GPA scale] is the passing grade for each part. No more than one grade on each part may be below a BC.

If two parts or fewer are failed, those parts only are required to be retaken, and may be retaken
only once. If three, four or five parts are failed, then the whole exam must be retaken and may be retaken only once. The candidate may retake the exam at the next scheduled time it is offered. However, the second attempt must occur within one calendar year after the first attempt has occurred. A second failure of a part or parts constitutes a second failure of the whole exam. If this is the case, the person ordinarily will not be allowed to continue in the program.

DGS’s unofficial note: All questions on Parts 1 and 2 should be answerable on the basis of the readings for those sections (although it certainly may be both possible and appropriate to bring in other readings with which you are familiar). Accordingly, these readings are required. The readings for Parts 3 and 4 are recommended readings. Basically, you should be familiar with key issues and philosophical strategies for dealing with these issues. You should be able to outline alternative arguments, show their merits and demerits, and to take and defend a philosophical position of your own. The reading list is meant to be an aid in preparing for this, but the readings are not required. You may well find the background you need elsewhere.

Opportunities to Enrich the Program

PGSA
The Philosophy Graduate Student Association (PGSA) is simply the society of all current Graduate Students of Philosophy at Marquette University. The purpose of the PGSA is to provide its members with opportunities to enhance their preparation for their vocations within the field of academic philosophy. To this end, the PGSA hosts an annual graduate student conference, organizes workshops for student research, provides the students with information about professional development opportunities, performs advising and program support services (such as preparation sessions for the doctoral qualifying exams), and acts as a liaison between students and faculty. It has also enjoyed a close relationship with the Preparing Future Faculty (PFF) program at Marquette, which is another avenue for graduate students to develop themselves professionally and academically. The PGSA is led and directed entirely by graduate students, and thus exists as a platform from which Marquette University graduate students can enrich their education and preparation for an academic career.

Membership in the PGSA is open to all philosophy graduate students and there are no dues.

Inter-University Visitation
The consortium of Midwest Catholic Graduate Schools (MCGS), which includes Loyola University, Chicago, Ill.; Marquette University, Milwaukee, Wis.; University of Notre Dame, South Bend, Ind.; and St. Louis University, St. Louis, Mo.; has established the protocol whereby a degree-seeking student at one university may take course work at any of the other three universities to apply toward degree requirements at the home institution. With prior approvals, the student enrolls at the home institution and makes financial arrangements there, but attends classes, on a short-term basis, as a visiting student at the host university. Final grades are forwarded from the host to the home university for listing on the student's permanent record. The following restrictions apply:
1.) Participation is restricted to those fields of study which are under the academic jurisdiction of the graduate deans at both the home and the host institutions.
2.) Non-degree or temporary students may not participate.
3.) The degree-seeking student must have completed at least the equivalent of one full term at the home university before visiting one of the other institutions.
4.) A student may gain approval for more than one visitation at more than one host institution, but no more than nine credit semester hours of courses from host institutions can become part of a degree program at the home institution. To participate, a student must complete, for each course to be taken at a host institution, an Interuniversity Visitation Enrollment Form and must obtain required signatures of approval. Because of the paperwork involved and the number of approvals that must be obtained, the student must begin the interuniversity visitation application process no later than June 1 for a fall term visitation, October 1 for the spring term, or March 1 for summer sessions. Interested students should contact the Graduate School Office for additional information and enrollment forms.

**Coursework at the Medical College of Wisconsin**
Under a special arrangement by the Graduate Schools of Marquette University and the Medical College of Wisconsin (MCW), students at each institution are eligible to enroll in courses at each institution. Philosophy Department students interested in enrolling in a course at MCW should consult with their advisors and then request permission to enroll from the Philosophy Department Director of Graduate Studies. This permission ensures that the students will receive graduate level credit at Marquette for that coursework at MCW. Enrollment also requires permission of the Director of Graduate Studies at MCW. For information on the MCW Program and Courses see: http://www.mcw.edu/bioethics/ for a complete list of course offerings at MCW see: http://www.mcw.edu/bioethics/programs.html

**Coursework at UWM**
Marquette and the University of Wisconsin–Milwaukee will allow their graduate students to enroll in certain courses at either university under a new agreement. Students from one university may take a course at the other institution as long as the course is not offered at the student's primary school. Students also may enroll in a course if completing it would allow a student to graduate at the end of the term at the home university. Initial exchange ideas include Marquette philosophy students taking Arabic courses at UWM while UWM students may take courses in genetics at Marquette. Prior approval from both graduate schools is required before enrolling in a course. Prior approval must be given by the Marquette University Philosophy Department Graduate Program Director or Department Chair. For Course listings at the University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee, see http://www.uwm.edu/Dept/Philosophy/blurbpage.html

**Other Opportunities**
We are a very active department. We sponsor a colloquium series, an annual Aquinas Lecture, foreign language reading groups, the Midwest Seminar in Ancient and Medieval Philosophy, the Seminar in Phenomenology and Hermeneutics, Workshop in Ethics, Social, and Political Philosophy, and the graduate student conference. Other departments also sponsor events of philosophical interest. It is expected from graduate students that they will participate in these events and thereby contribute to the greater intellectual life of the department.
More Dissertation Information and Dissertation Guidelines

A dissertation and its defense are the final requirements for the Ph.D. degree. Conventionally understood to be an original and substantive contribution to the student’s field, a dissertation is the result of sustained thought, research, consultation, and writing. As such, it can take many months, even years, of effort. The dissertation stage, however, requires timely progress from initial stages to successful completion. These guidelines should assist you in planning and executing this important project.

In the Philosophy Department, students are encouraged to begin to think about their dissertation as early as possible, even while they are completing course work. Classes and paper topics might be selected in part as ways to explore potential topics. Faculty members, who might assist with the preparation of the dissertation, including the advisor, could be consulted as well. Since the dissertation is to be the student’s original contribution to the scholarly community, at every stage in the dissertation process the student is ultimately responsible for the dissertation’s topic, writing, and submission.

The initial stage in this process will be for the student, in consultation with the advisor, to secure a dissertation director. The director should be someone who is knowledgeable in the field in which the student proposes to work and with whom the student can have a comfortable and productive working relationship. The director, in consultation with the student and the Director of Graduate Studies, sets up a dissertation committee consisting of the director, a second reader, and two additional readers.

The role of the second reader and the roles of the remaining committee members in the preparation of the dissertation are flexible and will be determined after consultation among the student, the director and the committee members. All four committee members will read the final version of the dissertation and will participate in the oral defense, but the director and second reader are to be most closely involved with the preparation of the thesis. The formal process for setting up the defense date was outlined in a memo from Dr. Jones distributed to students and faculty on December 30, 1998:

The process will begin not less than sixty days before the proposed date for the dissertation defense. The members of the committee will have 30 days to examine the dissertation during which period each member of the committee will determine whether the dissertation should proceed to defense and whether he or she is willing to agree to the proposed defense date and sign the necessary forms for formally setting the date.

These Philosophy Department procedures require that the second reader approve a final version of the dissertation as defensible prior to the distribution of this final version to the entire committee. The Committee then has 30 days in which to determine whether the dissertation should proceed to defense. If it is so approved, the Committee members will sign the required forms for setting the date for the oral defense. That oral defense may take place no less than 30 days after the signing of the required forms.
While setting up the committee, the student needs to prepare a Dissertation Outline, guidelines for which are available from the Graduate School. Some students do this while studying for their Doctoral Qualifying Examination. Outlines, which frequently undergo several revisions as they circulate among the student, director, second reader and potential committee members, should be submitted no more than 3-4 months after the Comps Exam has been taken and passed. The student is encouraged to submit an Outline and obtain approval for it even earlier. The earlier that an Outline is approved, the sooner the student can begin to work in earnest. Dissertations should not diverge substantially from the Outline so it is important to begin with a clear statement of purpose and procedure that can serve as a reference for all subsequent efforts on the dissertation. The Outline has the formal character of a contract and should not be considered easily revisable.

Since dissertations are such individual undertakings, their preparation will vary from student to student, but successful and timely completion of a dissertation always depends on sustained work. The best way for students to sustain their work is for them to keep in close consultation with their directors. At least one formal communication each month is thus strongly recommended, and more frequent meetings, phone calls, and emailing exchanges are common. In these communications, the director and the student discuss the student’s reading, writing, and general progress. Directors may suggest or require certain avenues of inquiry; they may set deadlines; and they will read the initial drafts of the dissertation’s chapters. These are drafts in the sense that they represent the student’s best current efforts but are not yet approved by the dissertation committee; they are not hasty, casual rough copies but crafted pieces of writing with complete citation conventions.

Directors will read these drafts in a timely fashion and return them to students with suggested alterations. At this stage of the process, some directors may draw on the second reader by circulating early drafts to her or him; others may wait until these drafts have been reworked. The second reader typically communicates a formal response to the student through the director, though students should feel free to call on the expertise and advice of the second reader at any time.

Both students and readers, thus, have clear responsibilities in the preparation of a dissertation. Directors will read, comment, advise, and encourage; but students, ultimately, must write their dissertations, and so primary responsibility rests with them. Students should be aware that faculty members have many responsibilities and cannot be expected to read chapters, much less entire dissertations, on short notice. Students should also be aware that they are expected to complete all work including the dissertation within 6 years.

The Graduate School has specific deadlines for the submission of a dissertation; it is the responsibility of the student to meet the requirements and deadlines of the Graduate School. More information on these and on the specifics of submitting a dissertation is available at the Graduate School. The annual Graduate School Bulletin announces the exact dates by which a defense must be held and a dissertation submitted, but in general the defense must occur no less than one month before graduation and it must be publicly announced still another month before
that. Since the committee must read a polished version before it can assent to announcement of a defense, such a version needs to be available not less than three months prior to anticipated graduation. Students and directors are advised to keep these requirements in mind as they craft timetables.

Many students require three years before they are admitted to candidacy and therefore have less than three years in which to complete their dissertations. Consequently, students cannot allow months to pass without verifiable progress, and those who do so risk not getting their Ph.D., which is never guaranteed to them. In such situations, or at any time when a dissertation does not seem to be progressing adequately, the Director of Graduate Studies or the Chair of the Department may be called upon for consultation.

Students should see that they are fully aware of dissertation guidelines, timetables and associated departmental and Graduate School policies expediting progress through this last stage of the Ph.D. program. The successful completion of the dissertation is a most challenging and rewarding project in which both students and the department takes great pride.

**Guidelines on the Sequence for Completing PH.D. Dissertation**

The starting point is at the beginning of your last semester of courses.

You are now finishing course work. You have passed your two foreign language exams. Of course, you put some thought into which 2 languages you chose to study so they will be of use, perhaps absolutely essential, to your dissertation. Of course, you chose your courses with some thought to the area(s) in which you intend to be an expert and do research and publish.

- **Last semester courses:** If it can be worked out, consider having one of your courses be an independent study. The subject of the independent study can be your dissertation outline proposal. Here’s the idea. Say you think you’re going to write a dissertation on Aquinas on the soul. See if someone on the faculty—perhaps your future director—will do an independent study with you on Aquinas on the soul. This can give you a nice start into the post comp phase of your career.

- **Comprehensive Exams study time:** If you complete courses in the spring semester, plan to take the comprehensive exams the following August. You should take comps the semester after the completion of course work. After all, your course work is preparation for comps. You are not inventing the wheel; you are fine tuning what you already know. Make sure you have a copy of the reading list as you prepare. Remember, unlike the systematic reading list, the history reading consists of required texts.

- **Part V of comps, the oral:** This is yet another way to jump start your Ph.D. dissertation. Your area for your oral exam should be in the area of your dissertation. This again allows you to do preparation work for your dissertation as you prepare for comps. So, if you are going to do a dissertation on the divine command theory of morality, then choose either philosophy of religion or ethics as your area for part V. Sometimes students choose an area for part V that has nothing
to do with their dissertation. This results in an opportunity lost for a smooth transition into the dissertation and wastes valuable time that did not need to be wasted.

• Planning Steps for Comps: These things should be done the semester before you take comps.

1. Get copies of old comps. This will give you a sense of the sort of questions that arise.

2. Do a review of all the courses you have had at Marquette.

3. Have a plan of study and stick with it from day one of preparation.

4. Don’t be bashful about asking questions of your committee chair as you prepare with regard to preparation, strategy, etc. Everyone wants you to succeed.

A number of our Ph.D. students after completing comps realize they have virtually no idea about what subject they intend to write a dissertation. It has been suggested above that practical ways to avoid this predicament include an independent study at the end of course work on your proposed dissertation area or topic, and choosing an area for Part V of the comps which will be your area for your dissertation. Perhaps more importantly, by your second year in grad school, you should be thinking about your dissertation topic. Pin down an area, e.g., philosophy of religion. The test is something like this: What really interests me philosophically? What is important to me? To what sorts of issues do I wish to devote my professional career? Constantly ask yourself these questions. You are then likely to arrive at an area for your dissertation. As you get closer to completion of the comprehensive exam, start fine tuning. Say you have read and have been impressed by Alston’s claim that religious experience can be a ground for religious belief but you hold that Alston’s work needs to be explored further in greater depth. Now you’re starting to develop a thesis topic. Asking and answering these questions can greatly reduce the time required to write an outline after completion of comps.

The dissertation outline is an agreement between you and the members of the board about what you will do in the dissertation. It is not supposed to be an abridged dissertation. Follow the headings of the Graduate school form and provide the basic knowledge you and the members of your board need in order to agree on what the work of the dissertation is (by specifying the originality of your work given the state of the literature on the topic), how it will be done (offer a brief description of each of the chapters), when it will be completed (offer a schedule of when you plan to finish each chapter), how long it will be, what bibliography you will use, etc. After you have written the outline proposal following the grad school form to the letter, submit it to your director. If he or she approves it and the second reader does so as well, then it should be submitted to the rest of the committee for approval. Once this is done, you are on your way to actually writing the dissertation. This process should not take more than 90 days from the time you complete the comprehensive exam, and should never take more than 120 days short of emergency personal factors.

• Picking Your Dissertation Director, 2nd Reader, and Committee:
This is important. It is essential to pick a director who is (a) an expert in your area if not your specific topic, and (b) someone with whom you have a good professional relationship. It is
highly desirable to pick a director with whom you have taken courses. It is highly desirable to have a detailed conversation with the proposed director before you write the outline to be sure that the director is willing to direct and is on the same page with you about your dissertation. After the director accepts, you and the director should then discuss candidates for the position of 2nd reader. Once the proposal is acceptable to the director, the student talks to the Director of Graduate Studies to see what faculty members are available to sit on the committee. Committees now have four members. The 2nd reader may or may not read the dissertation chapter by chapter and work with you and the director as you progress. The 2nd reader may or may not read first drafts. The precise details and preferred procedures will need to be worked out between you, the director, and 2nd reader. The 2nd reader should have some expertise in the area of your dissertation, perhaps very considerable expertise. After the 2nd reader has accepted, you should choose the other 2 members of your committee in consultation with your director, get their acceptance, and ascertain what their role will be in the project. While perhaps desirable, it is not absolutely required that all the other members of your committee be experts in the area of your dissertation. After the outline has been read by all members and tentatively approved, you are required to have a meeting with all committee members to have the outline formally approved. This way all members know what is expected. Such strategy will likely reduce the chances of problems down the road. Tip: If you are uncomfortable with a faculty member or have a personality conflict with a faculty member, do not have that faculty member be a member of your committee. Do not ask a faculty member who is on leave or sabbatical to be on your committee. These faculty members are on leave or sabbatical to focus on their own research and normally are not asked to be members of dissertation committees. Finally, remember that the committee and the final version of the Dissertation Proposal must be formally approved by the Graduate Director acting in behalf of the Department. Only then is it submitted to the Graduate School for its approval, the final step.

• Writing your dissertation

1. Work regularly with your director and perhaps your 2nd reader. Setting up a regular time (say 3:00 every other Monday) to discuss your progress is most helpful and keeps you on track.

2. You should expect to stay in Milwaukee while you’re writing your dissertation. The chances that you will finish and finish in a reasonable time frame go up dramatically if you stay part of the Marquette community. They go down dramatically if you leave the area. The Department strongly discourages students from leaving the Milwaukee area before the dissertation is complete.

3. We expect you to write a dissertation of high quality. You are attempting to earn the highest academic degree in the land. This point should be remembered.

4. Take your mental health seriously. There will be highs and lows. Recognize this and make a real effort to keep things in perspective when you discover bumps in the road.

Finishing your dissertation in a timely manner is impressive and will give you a significant advantage on the job market. If you do your part, the philosophy department will do whatever it
can to assist you in finding a full time position in a university philosophy department.

**Model Timetables for Ph.D. Students on Aid Lines**

Two model timetables, for students entering with the B.A. and for students entering with the M.A., were approved by the Philosophy Department (3/5/99) as recommended courses of study for students who seek to obtain the Ph.D. in four years (when entering the program with the M.A.) and in five years (when entering the program with the B.A.).

Three key elements in the Model Timetables are: (1) Students are considered active in summers taking courses and studying foreign languages; (2) Students are expected to take three courses in any semester when they do not have a new teaching preparation; and (3) Students are expected to choose finite dissertation topics which can move from the stage of Proposal Preparation to the final stage of defense of the dissertation in a period of approximately 1 3/4 years or less.

All students should note that the financial aid available for the Department makes it almost impossible to provide regular financial aid in the form of RAs or TAs to students after the completion of the fourth year.

While Lectureships are sometimes available, these are not guaranteed. Moreover, students who take five or more years to complete their work for the Ph.D. often find it all the more difficult to complete dissertations and take much longer than expected due to their need to work outside Philosophy to cover their living expenses while writing their dissertations.

In addition to the quality of a student’s work, the model timetables are to be taken into account as guidelines for awarding aid to students continuing on financial aid (from the Executive Committee minutes of 2/15/99 as amended by the Philosophy Department 3/5/99): "The Executive Committee recommends that these timetables be used as guidelines in evaluating students’ progress in the Ph.D. program for the purposes of continuing financial aid. The timetables should be used by the Director of Graduate Studies as flexible guidelines, and not as hard and fast, absolute rules, in evaluating student’s progress through the Ph.D. program. The Department expects the student with financial aid to make reasonable progress through the program in accordance with the timetables. This presumption can be rebutted by students. For example, serious illness or family difficulties can legitimately slow a student’s progress toward completion of the Ph.D. degree. If the student departs from the timetable, the student must justify these departures to the satisfaction of the Director of Graduate Studies.”

**Entering with an M.A. Seeking to Obtain the Ph.D. in Four Years**

**Student with M.A., not teaching at entry**

*Year 1 semester 1*

- 3 courses (among the required courses in the history of philosophy or electives) (9 cr. tot.)
- Foreign Language #1 Study
- RA work

*Year 1 semester 2*

- 3 courses (among the required courses in the history of philosophy or electives), Elective (18 cr. tot.)
Foreign Language #1 Study
RA work

*Year 1 Summer Sessions 1 & 2*
(Phil) Elective (21 cr. tot.)
Foreign Language #1 or #2 Study

*Year 2 semester 1*
2 courses (among the required courses in the history of philosophy or electives) (27 cr. tot.)
Foreign Language #2 Study
Teaching 2 courses

*Year 2 semester 2*
1 or 2 courses (among the required courses in the history of philosophy or electives) (30-33 cr. tot.)
Foreign Language #2 Study
Teaching 2 courses

*Year 2 Summer Sessions 1 & 2*
Comps Prep (and Foreign Language Study if necessary)

*Year 3 semesters 1 & 2*
Teaching 2 courses
Comps Exams August or January
Dissertation Proposal Draft December 15
Final Version of Dissertation Proposal February 1
Dissertation: e.g., 6 chapters x 35 pp=210 pp. + bibliog.; 6 chapters, 1 chapter every 6 weeks.
April 1: ch. 1

*Year 3 Summer Sessions*
May 15: ch. 2
July 1: ch. 3

*Year 4 semesters 1 & 2*
Teaching 2 courses
August 15: ch. 4
October 1: ch. 5
December 15: ch. 6 (Final Chapter).
Revisions are done continuously.
Final Copy Distributed: February 15
Dissertation Program Approved: March 15
Student with M.A., teaching at entry

"Year 1 semester 1
2 courses (among the required courses in the history of philosophy or electives) (6 cr. tot.)
Foreign Language #1 Study
Teaching 2 courses

Year 1 semester 2
2 courses (among the required courses in the history of philosophy or electives) (12 cr. tot.)
Foreign Language #1 Study
Teaching 2 courses

Year 1 Summer Sessions 1 & 2
(Phil) Elective (2) (18 cr. tot.)
Foreign Language #1 or #2 Study

Year 2 semester 1
2 courses (among the required courses in the history of philosophy or electives) (24 cr. tot.)
Foreign Language #2 Study
Teaching 2 courses

Year 2 semester 2
2 courses (among the required courses in the history of philosophy or electives) (33 cr. tot.)
Foreign Language #2 Study
Teaching 2 courses

Year 2 Summer Sessions 1 & 2
Comps Prep (and Foreign Language Study if necessary)

Year 3 semesters 1 & 2
Teaching 2 courses
Comps Exams August or January
Dissertation Proposal Draft December 15
Final Version of Dissertation Proposal February 1
Dissertation: e.g., 6 chapters x 35 pp=210 pp. + bibliog.; 6 chapters, 1 chapter every 6 weeks.
April 1: ch. 1
Year 3 Summer Sessions
May 15: ch. 2
July 1: ch. 3

Year 4 semesters 1 & 2
Teaching 2 courses
August 15: ch. 4
October 1: ch. 5
December 15: ch. 6 (Final Chapter).
Revisions are done continuously.
Final Copy Distributed: February 15
Dissertation Program Approved: March 15

**Recommended Course of Ph. D. Studies in Philosophy for Students Entering with a B.A. Who Seek to Obtain the Ph.D. in Five Years**

*Year 1 semester 1*
- 3 courses (among the required courses in the history of philosophy or electives) (9 cr. tot.)
- Foreign Language #1 Study
- RA work

*Year 1 semester 2*
- 3 courses (among the required courses in the history of philosophy or electives) (18 cr. tot.)
- Foreign Language #1 Study
- RA work

*Year 1 Summer Sessions 1 & 2*
- Phil Elective x 1 (21 cr. tot.)
- Foreign Language #1 or #2 Study

*Year 2 semester 1*
- 3 courses (among the required courses in the history of philosophy or electives) (30 cr. tot.)
- Foreign Language #2 Study
- RA work

*Year 2 semester 2*
- 3 courses (among the required courses in the history of philosophy or electives) (39 cr. tot.)
- Foreign Language #2 Study
- RA work

*Year 2 Summer Sessions 1 & 2*
- Phil Elective x 1 (42 cr. tot.)
- Foreign Language #2 Study

*Year 3 semester 1*
- 2 courses (among the required courses in the history of philosophy or electives) (48 cr. tot.)
- Foreign Language #2 Study (if necessary)
- Teaching 2 courses

*Year 3 semester 2*
- 2 courses (among the required courses in the history of philosophy or electives) (54 cr. tot.)
- Foreign Language #2 Study (if necessary)
Teaching 2 courses

*Year 3 Summer Sessions 1 & 2*
Phil Elective x 2 (60 cr. tot.)
Comps Prep

*Year 4 semesters 1 & 2*
Teaching 2 courses
Comps Exams August or January
Dissertation Proposal Draft December 15
Final Version of Dissertation Proposal February 1
Dissertation: e.g., 6 chapters x 35 pp = 210 pp. + bibliog.; 6 chapters, 1 chapter every 6 weeks.
April 1: ch. 1

*Year 4 Summer Sessions*
May 15: ch. 2; July 1: ch. 3;

*Year 5 semesters 1 & 2*
Teaching 2 courses
August 15: ch. 4
October 1: ch. 5
December 15: ch. 6
Revisions are done continuously.
Final Copy Distributed: February 15
Dissertation Program
Signed and to Grad School: March 15
Academic Honesty

All students are expected to familiarize themselves with the rules and regulations concerning possible issues of Academic Dishonesty as those are stated in the Graduate School Bulletin for 2009-10 and the College of Arts and Sciences Faculty Handbook of Procedures. Both are available at the Marquette University Website. Students may consult the Director of Graduate Studies for any needed clarifications.

The following is taken from the Graduate School Bulletin of 2009-2010:

“PREAMBLE
Marquette University is committed to developing the whole person, spiritually, mentally, physically, socially, and ethically. As an institution of higher education, love of truth is at the center of the university’s enterprise, and academic honesty, in all its forms, is an explicit value of the university. The development and practice of academic honesty and integrity, both inside and outside the classroom, are expectations for all members of the university community. In order to cultivate academic honesty in its students, instructors take every opportunity to help students appreciate both the process and the principles of academic integrity. Academic honesty can be best understood by academic ethical standards guiding faculty in their work. That is to say, an individual’s contributions, in terms of words and scholarly findings, belong to him or her alone. Furthermore, the integrity of that which one claims to be scholarly knowledge rests on the accurate demonstration of the assumptions and reasoning that produced it. These standards are used as the implicit basis for teaching and learning in the university. In order for instructors to fairly assess the quality and quantity of a student’s learning as determined by work that students represent as their own, a relationship of trust between instructor and student is essential. Because violations of academic integrity most often involve, but are not limited to, efforts to deceive instructors, they represent a breach of the trust relationship between instructor and student, and undermine the core values of the university.

Responsibility For Academic Honesty

This policy applies to all undergraduate programs and to students and faculty in some programs under the auspices of the Graduate School. Graduate School generically refers to all graduate and professional schools and students, and terms such as associate vice provost or associate/assistant dean will refer to the appropriate official in the other colleges/schools. Graduate School students should appeal to the Graduate School while professional students should appeal to the appropriate person in their college or school, i.e., Graduate School of Management or College of Health Sciences. School of Dentistry and Law School students must follow the policies put forth by their respective schools.

ACADEMIC HONESTY consists of truth telling and truthful representations in all academic contexts. All members of the academic community have a responsibility to ensure that academic honesty is maintained. In what follows the wording “chair” refers to either a department chair or an equivalent official, “associate dean” refers to either an associate dean or an equivalent official, or in the case of the Graduate School it will refer to the assistant vice provost for graduate programs, the word “college” refers to a college, school, or other academic unit, and the
words “assigned college” refers to the degree granting college or school (i.e. for graduate students the assigned college is the Graduate School).

Faculty have primary responsibility for:
1. Upholding and enforcing university wide principles of academic honesty and integrity and informing students of these principles including any qualifications that may be operative in the classes they are teaching.
2. Minimizing opportunities for academic dishonesty in their courses.
3. Confronting students suspected of academic dishonesty in a way that respects student privacy.
4. Affording students accused of academic dishonesty the right to appeal any resulting disputes to disinterested parties for hearing and resolution.
5. Assigning an appropriate grade to a student who engages in academic dishonesty.
6. Reporting all instances of academic dishonesty to the associate dean of the college offering the course.
7. Protecting the anonymity of any student reporting an incident of academic dishonesty to the extent permitted by due process required for the accused and other legal requirements.

Students have responsibility for:
1. Refraining from cheating and plagiarism.
2. Refusing to aid or abet any form of academic dishonesty.
3. Notifying professors and/or their advisor about observed incidents of academic misconduct.

The anonymity of a student reporting an incident of academic dishonesty will be protected to the extent permitted by law.

Definitions Of Academic Dishonesty

ACADEMIC DISHONESTY applies equally to electronic media and print, and involves text, images, and ideas. It includes but is not limited to the following examples:

*Cheating*
1. Copying from others during an examination.
2. Communicating exam answers with other students during an examination.
3. Offering another person’s work as one’s own.
4. Taking an examination for another student or having someone take an examination for oneself.
5. Sharing answers for a take home examination or assignment unless specifically authorized by the instructor.
6. Tampering with an examination after it has been corrected, and then returning it for more credit.
7. Using unauthorized materials during an examination.
8. Allowing others to do the research and writing of an assigned paper (including use of the services of a commercial term paper company).

*Dishonest Conduct*
1. Stealing or attempting to steal an examination or answer key from the instructor.
2. Changing or attempting to change academic records without proper sanction.
3. Submitting substantial portions of the same work for credit in more than one course without consulting all instructors involved.
4. Intentionally disrupting the educational process in any manner.
5. Allowing another student to copy off one’s own work during a test.

Plagiarism
Plagiarism is intellectual theft. It means use of the intellectual creations of another without proper attribution. Plagiarism may take two main forms, which are clearly related: 1. To steal or pass off as one’s own the ideas or words, images, or other creative works of another and 2. To use a creative production without crediting the source, even if only minimal information is available to identify it for citation.
Credit must be given for every direct quotation, for paraphrasing or summarizing a work (in whole, or in part, in one’s own words), and for information that is not common knowledge.

Collusion
Any student who knowingly or intentionally helps another student perform any of the above acts of cheating, dishonest conduct, or plagiarism is subject to discipline for academic dishonesty.

Research Misconduct
Marquette University has a duty to ensure the integrity of research and will respond to any allegation of research misconduct in a thorough, competent, timely, objective, and fair manner. Research misconduct is defined as fabrication, falsification, or plagiarism in proposing, performing, or reviewing research, or in reporting research results. The research misconduct policy applies to faculty, students, and others who are employed by or affiliated with Marquette University. Students who are accused of misconduct related to grant-funded research shall be governed by the procedures of the research misconduct policy, found at www.marquette.edu/orsp/policies/upp.shtml. Students who are accused of misconduct related to research that is not grant-funded and is a part of a student’s academic program will be governed by the University Policy on Academic Honesty, found at www.marquette.edu/rc/academichonesty.shtml. Any uncertainty related to which policy will govern a given situations will be decided by the research integrity officer.

Consequences Of Academic Dishonesty
Regardless of how alleged acts of academic dishonesty are brought to light, faculty and instructors retain the responsibility and the authority to investigate all allegations, although, as outlined below, university administrators may lead these investigations. Because the consequences for academic dishonesty can be severe, the decision to penalize a student for such infractions must be the result of a thorough review. The procedures to be used for adjudicating suspected acts of academic dishonesty are determined by the nature of the misconduct and the seriousness of the offense.

Procedures For Incidents Of Academic Dishonesty
Students found committing acts of academic dishonesty will be subject to the Marquette University procedures for incidents of academic dishonesty. In what follows the wording “chair” refers to either a department chair or an equivalent official, “associate dean” refers to either an associate dean or an equivalent official, or in the case of the Graduate School it shall refer to the assistant vice provost, the word “college” refers to a college, school, or other academic unit, and
the words “assigned college” refers to the college granting the degree (i.e. for graduate students
the assigned college is the Graduate School).

FIRST OFFENSES
Many, perhaps most, incidents of academic dishonesty involve accusations which are based
on clear evidence and which are not contested by the accused student. In such cases, if the
infraction is relatively minor and there is no indication that the accused student has previously
been involved in such incidents, it is most appropriate that the matter be resolved between the
student, the faculty member, and the chair of the department offering the course.
When a faculty member has evidence of a student’s academic dishonesty, the faculty member
must initiate communication with the student within 15 calendar days of discovering evidence
of academic dishonesty. The faculty member must then present the evidence to the student in
a private meeting, always with a facilitator present (e.g., department chair or designee). This
meeting should take place within 15 calendar days of the student being notified of the allegation
or as soon thereafter as possible. If, after this meeting, it is decided that the student did
participate in academic dishonesty the faculty member may follow up with one or more of the
following actions:
1. Issue a reprimand to the student
2. Require repetition of the questionable work or examination
3. Reduce the grade on the questionable work or examination (faculty can reduce the grade
down to and including an “F” or zero)
4. Recommend that the student be administratively withdrawn from the course
5. Recommend that the student be given a final grade of “F” for the course
The faculty must maintain careful documentation of the incident.
It is essential that any disciplinary action be reported in writing to the student in a letter
from the faculty member. The faculty member is strongly encouraged to consult with his or her
associate dean for questions about appropriate discipline and the form and content of the letter
sent to the student. Reference to the “Marquette University Policies on Academic Honesty”
should be included in the letter. The letter to the student must be sent out within 15 calendar
days of the meeting and may be sent by e-mail with settings for “notify sender of receipt and of
opening”. At the same time the letter is sent to the student, a copy must be sent to the department
chair and associate dean of the college offering the course. In turn, within 5 working days,
the associate dean of the college offering the course will communicate in writing details of the
incident to the associate dean of the student’s assigned college, to ensure that penalties assessed
are commensurate with the offense and that repeated infractions can be detected and dealt with
appropriately. The associate dean of each college is responsible for maintaining confidential
records concerning academic dishonesty of students enrolled in that college. All letters reporting
faculty imposed academic penalties for academic misconduct will be included in these files.
In most incidents the disciplinary response and procedure for incidents of academic dishonesty
concludes at this step.

Student’s Appeal
Students have the right of appeal of the allegations of academic dishonesty and the disciplinary
actions of the instructor if the student believes the alleged incident of academic dishonesty
and/or resultant academic discipline to be unfounded, biased, or capricious. In this case the
student should submit a formal written appeal stating the grounds for appeal and available documentation to the associate dean of the college offering the course within 15 calendar days of the notification of the instructor’s decision. Upon receipt of the appeal the associate dean may convene a review of the student’s actions by a college panel. The associate dean and/or panel reviews the details of the student’s actions and may ask to speak to the student, the instructor, the chair of the department offering the course, associate deans, and others. The associate dean of the college offering the course will determine the appropriate disciplinary action and, within 15 calendar days of receipt of the appeal, will provide a written statement to all parties concerned.

Disciplinary Recommendations By Faculty Of Adw Or F
If the faculty member recommends that the student be administratively withdrawn from the course and assigned a final grade of ADW or that a final grade of F be assigned, the associate dean of the student’s assigned college (the assistant vice provost for graduate programs) will review the details of the incident and make the final decision within 5 working days of receipt of the request, and provide a written statement to all parties concerned.

Students have the right to appeal the decision of the associate dean to issue grades of ADW or F to the dean of the student’s assigned college (the dean of the Graduate School in the case of graduate students). This appeal must be made within 15 calendar days of the notification of the grade change. The final decision to uphold or modify the action of the associate dean will be provided to the student and associate dean within 15 calendar days of receipt of the appeal. The decision of the dean is final.

Repeat Or More Serious Offenses
When the associate dean (in the case of graduate students to the assistant vice provost for graduate programs) of the student’s assigned college is aware of or determines that the student has engaged in multiple incidents of academic dishonesty or the incident in question is of a more serious nature he/she will convene a review of the student’s actions by a college panel within 15 calendar days of learning of the most recent incident. In the case of graduate students, such a panel will be composed of a sub-committee of the University Board of Graduate Studies. More serious incidents may involve repeat offenses, cause injury or harm to others outside the academic community, or other actions deemed to warrant additional consideration. These incidents of academic dishonesty call for more serious disciplinary action up to and including campus wide sanctions of suspension or expulsion. Where incidents involve possible violations of the University Code of Conduct, in addition to the alleged academic dishonesty, consultation with the Office of Student Development is recommended.

Each college will have guidelines for the composition and selection of the College Panel to assure a review by experienced faculty and/or administrators not directly involved in the incident(s). The panel reviews all aspects of the student’s record, the details of the student’s behavior and may ask the student, instructor(s), and others to speak with the panel. Within 15 calendar days of being given the charge, the panel will forward its recommendations for appropriate and just disciplinary action to the associate dean (in the case of graduate students to the assistant vice provost for graduate programs) of the student’s assigned college with a copy to the dean. All disciplinary decisions that involve a campus wide sanction, such as suspension or expulsion, will be made by the dean of the student’s assigned college with all other actions being
taken by the associate dean. Within 15 calendar days of receiving the panel’s recommendation, the associate dean or dean, as appropriate, makes the decision known to the student via written documentation that includes a description of the academic dishonesty, the process the decision went through, the resulting decision and appeal procedures. A copy of the decision is placed in the student’s academic file with a copy provided to the Office of the Provost. Students have the right of appeal of the allegation of academic dishonesty and the disciplinary actions of the associate dean or the dean of the student’s assigned college. Such appeals must be made within 15 calendar days of receipt of the letter. Actions taken by the associate dean should be appealed to the dean of the student’s assigned college. The final decision to uphold or modify the action of the associate dean will be provided to the student and associate dean within 15 calendar days of receipt of the appeal. The decision of the dean is final. For actions of the dean involving campus-wide sanctions, such as suspension or expulsion, students have the right of appeal to the Office of the Provost. A formal written appeal stating the grounds for appeal and available documentation is to be submitted to the Office of the Provost within 15 calendar days of the notification of the decision of the dean. The provost or designee will conduct a review of the appeal materials, may seek additional information, and may consult with the student, faculty, chair(s), associate dean(s), deans, and others. The final decision to uphold or modify the action of the dean will be provided to the student and to the dean and associate dean of the student’s assigned college within 15 calendar days of receipt of the appeal. A copy of the provost’s decision will be placed in the student academic file. The decision of the provost is final.

Other Considerations
The associate dean may exclude students who have on file recorded acts of academic dishonesty, as defined by this policy, from consideration for academic honors at graduation. Exclusion from consideration for honors is not for the purposes of this policy to be considered a campus wide sanction.

Maintenance Of Disciplinary Records
Records relating to academic dishonesty will be maintained by the associate dean of the student’s assigned college to promote consistency of penalties for academic dishonesty and to ensure appropriate action against repeat offenders. In order to ensure that minor and nonrecurring infractions do not negatively impact a student’s career beyond Marquette University, a student may petition to the associate dean of his or her academic college to have relevant academic disciplinary records expunged after the student graduates or leaves the university. The associate dean has sole authority to consider and to grant or deny such petitions. The university will release a student’s disciplinary records to potential employers, governmental agencies, other educational institutions, or other organizations or individuals only if authorized to do so by the student in question or compelled by law” (Graduate Bulletin 2009-2010, Marquette University, 9-13; Graduate Bulletin 2010-2011, 9-13).

Marquette University Statement on Human Dignity and Diversity
As a Catholic, Jesuit university, Marquette recognizes and cherishes the dignity of each individual regardless of age, culture, faith, ethnicity, race, gender, sexual orientation, language,
disability or social class. Precisely because Catholicism at its best seeks to be inclusive, we are open to all who share our mission and seek the truth about God and the world. Through our admissions and employment policies and practices, our curricular and co-curricular offerings, and our welcoming and caring campus environment, Marquette seeks to become a more diverse and inclusive academic community dedicated to the promotion of justice.

Our commitment to a diverse university community helps us to achieve excellence by promoting a culture of learning, appreciation and understanding. Each member of the Marquette community is charged to treat everyone with care and respect, and to value and treasure differences. This call to action is integral to the tradition which we share.

**Racial Abuse and Harassment Policy**

Marquette University, as a Catholic institution, is dedicated to the proposition that all human beings possess inherent dignity in the eyes of their Creator and equality in the eyes of each other. The university entirely and consistently condemns, as a matter of principle, any unlawful or wrongful discrimination against the rights of others.

As the university is committed to maintaining an environment in which the dignity and worth of each member of its community are respected, it is the policy of the university that racial abuse or harassment of or by students, faculty, staff, and guests or visitors will not be tolerated. Such behavior of identified individuals or groups will be subject to appropriate action including, but not limited to education, probation, suspension, or expulsion from the institution or the campus, and/or civil or criminal action in some instances.

Racial abuse is defined ordinarily as verbal, written, or physical conduct directed at a person or a group based on one’s color, race, national origin, or ethnicity where the offensive behavior is intimidating, hostile or demeaning, or which could or does result in mental, emotional, or physical discomfort, embarrassment, ridicule, or harm.

Racial harassment differs from general abuse only in that it is defined ordinarily as repeated, persistent or continual verbal, written, or physical conduct directed at a person or a group or different individuals on separate occasions.

Racial abuse and harassment include not only offensive behavior which interferes with a person’s or group’s well-being or development, but also such behaviors which interfere with one’s employment or educational status or performance, or which create a hostile working, academic, or social environment.

It is a violation for a university person, student, faculty, administrator, staff, guest or visitor, or anyone else acting at the instigation of a university person to:

1. Engage in any form of racial abuse or harassment intentionally or unintentionally on the campus, on the immediately adjoining sidewalks or streets, or in the off-campus area.
2. Retaliate against a person who has initiated an inquiry or complaint having to do with racial abuse or harassment.
Information about a concern or complaint is available from the following offices: Dean of Students, Multicultural Center, Campus International Programs, Academic Deans/Directors, and Affirmative Action. Anyone with a concern or complaint about a student should contact the Dean of Students, Multicultural Center, or Campus International Programs. Anyone with a complaint about an employee (including a student employee) should contact that person’s immediate supervisor. If the complaint is with the immediate supervisor, the employee should contact the supervisor’s immediate superior. A complaint about a guest or visitor should be called to the attention of the host or the supervisor of the area or event where the concern has arisen. Any student or employee may also contact the Affirmative Action Officer for counseling and assistance.

The right of confidentiality for any party involved in a racial abuse or harassment incident, including the complainant and the accused, will be respected insofar as it does not interfere with the university’s obligation to investigate allegations of misconduct and to take corrective action where appropriate.

**Sexual Harassment Policy**
Marquette University is committed to maintaining an environment in which the dignity of each member of its community is respected. Sexual harassment, by, or of, either sex is prohibited by faculty, administrators, staff, students or other individuals who may be present on Marquette’s campus or in any other location for a Marquette-sponsored activity. It is also prohibited to retaliate in any way against an individual who has initiated a sexual harassment complaint. The University maintains a "zero-tolerance" stance toward sexual harassment and will address and investigate all complaints in a timely, comprehensive and equitable fashion. Violators of this policy will be subject to appropriate corrective and disciplinary action, up to and including separation or termination from the University.

Academic and non-academic management and supervisory personnel, at all levels, are responsible for taking reasonable and necessary action to prevent sexual harassment. All members of the University community, faculty, administrators, staff, and students, are required to promptly report, pursuant to these policies and procedures, conduct that could be in violation of this policy.

The University will (1) respond to every formal and informal complaint of sexual harassment reported; (2) take action to provide remedies when sexual harassment is discovered; (3) impose appropriate sanctions on offenders in a case-by-case manner; and (4) protect the privacy of all those involved in sexual harassment complaints to the extent it is possible.

**What is Sexual Harassment?**
Sexual harassment is defined, within the workplace for employees and/or within the academic and/or residential experience for students, as any unwelcome sexual advances, demands, requests for sexual favors, innuendoes or any other verbal or physical conduct of a sexual nature when:

(1) Submission to such conduct is made either explicitly or implicitly a term or condition of an individual's employment or education experience; or (2) Submission to or rejection of such
conduct by an individual is used as the basis for employment or educational decisions affecting such individual; or (3) Such conduct is sufficiently severe and pervasive so as to alter the conditions of, or have the purpose or effect of substantially interfering with, an individual's work or academic performance by creating an intimidating, hostile, or offensive working or educational environment.

Harassment does not include verbal expressions or written material that is relevant and appropriately related to course subject matter or curriculum, and this policy will not abridge academic freedom. Bona fide "consensual" relationships likewise will not be considered harassment under the intent of this policy.
Reading List for the M.A. Comprehensive Exam

Historical Section

ARISTOTLE - *Posterior Analytics* - Books I, II, nos. 1, 2, and 19; *Physics* - Books 1, 2, 3; *Metaphysics* - Books 1 and 12; *De Anima* - Book I, ch. 1, Books II and III

PLATO - *Protagoras, Sophist, Meno, Gorgias, Republic* - Books I-VII (incl.), *Phaedo, Symposium*

AUGUSTINE - *De Trinitate* - Book 8-15 (incl.); *De Libero Arbitrio*

ST. THOMAS - *Summa Theologiae* - I,1-26; 75 and 76; *Quaestiones de Anima*, qq. 1, 2, 3, 8, 9; *De Spiritualibus creaturis*, a.1-11 (incl.)

DESCARTES - *Discourse on Method; Meditations*

SPINOZA - *Ethics* - Book I (W.H. White translation, contained also in J. Wild, *Spinoza Selections*)


BERKELEY - *Principles*

HUME - *Treatise* - Book I, part 1, 3, 4

KANT - *Critique of Pure Reason* (up to distinction of noumenon and phenomenon and last section of about 30 pages); *Fundamentals of Metaphysics of Morals*

HEGEL - *Encyclopedia of Sciences* (Part I, Logic)

For Section E, the student must choose in advance an important philosophical work from the Twentieth or Twenty-first Century determined by the student in consultation with the examining committee and with the approval of the Director of Graduate Studies. Two questions will be drawn from this work. Only one must be answered.

A List of Readings on Problems in Systematic Philosophy

The following readings are suggestions offered by individual faculty members of the department of philosophy that a student might use in preparing to take the comprehensive examination on problems in systematic philosophy. They are not required readings, but a student preparing for
the M.A. comprehensive examination might find the list of help, if prudentially used with the
guidance of his or her advisor.

**Metaphysics**
Richard Taylor, *Metaphysics*
Bruce Aune, *Metaphysics*
Michael Loux, ed., *Universals and Particulars*
Thomas Nagel, *The View from Nowhere*
Joseph Owens, *An Interpretation of Existence*

**Epistemology**
Roderick Chisholm, *Theory of Knowledge*
Robert Henle, *Theory of Knowledge*
John Pollock, *Contemporary Theories of Knowledge*
Etienne Gilson, *Thomistic Realism and the Critique of Knowledge*
Nelson Goodman, *The Structure of Appearance*

**Ethics**
William Frankena, *Ethics*
Alasdair Macintyre, *After Virtue*
Ralph McInerny, *Ethica Thomistica*
Josef Pieper, *The Four Cardinal Virtues*

**Philosophy of Law**
Daniel Lyons, *Ethics and the Rule of Law*
Martin Golding, *Philosophy of Law*
Thomas A. Davitt, *The Elements of Law*

**Political Philosophy**
Neal Riemer, *A Revival of Political Theory*
Howard Kainz, *Democracy East and West*
John Rawls, *A Theory of Justice*
Yves Simon, *The Nature and Functions of Authority*
Paul Sigmund, *The Political Thought of St. Thomas Aquinas*

**Philosophy of Language**
William Alston, *The Philosophy of Language*
John Searle, *Speech Acts*
Jay Rosenberg and Charles Travis, eds., *Readings in the Philosophy of Language*
Michael Devitt, *Language and Reality*
Jacques Derrida, *Speech and Phenomena*
Aesthetics
Monroe Beardsley, Aesthetics: *Problems in the Philosophy of Criticism*
Nelson Goodman, *Languages of Art*
William Kennic, ed., *Art and Philosophy*
Arthur Danto, *The Transfiguration of the Commonplace*
Brian Wallis, ed., *Rethinking Representation*

Philosophy of Science
Carl Hempel, *The Philosophy of Natural Science*
Nelson Goodman, *Fact, Fiction and Forecast*
Baruch Brody, ed., *Readings in the Philosophy of Science*
Thomas Kuhn, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*
Michel Foucault, *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*
Reading List for the Ph.D. Comprehensive Exam

Part I: Ancient & Medieval

A. Required Selections in Ancient Philosophy:


Aristotle (recommended edition: The Complete Works of Aristotle : The Revised Oxford Translation. Edited by Jonathan Barnes, Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, c1984): Categories 1-5; Posterior Analytics 1.1-10, 13; 2.1-2.19; Physics 1.1, 1.7-9; 2.1-3.3, 3.6; 4.11; 5.1; 8.1-6, 10; De Anima 1.1; 2.1-7,11-12; 3.1-10; Metaphysics 1.1-3.1; 4.1-3, 5.7, 12; 6.1; 7.1-8.6; 9.8; 12.1, 6-10; Nicomachean Ethics 1-2; 3.1-5; 6-7.5; 8.1-3; 10.4-9; Politics 1.1-2.5; 7.1-3


B. Required Selections in Medieval Philosophy*:


Averroes: The Decisive Treatise; Selections from A Treatise Concerning the Substance of the
Celestial Sphere (De substantia orbis) and from the Long Commentary on the De Anima. All three pieces in Hyman & Walsh pp. 297-334


Al-Ghazali: Selections from Deliverance from Error, Hyman & Walsh pp. 267-283.


Duns Scotus: Selections from The Oxford Commentary on the Four Books of the Sentences, Hyman & Walsh, pp. 602-646.

William of Ockham: All the selections assembled in Hyman & Walsh, pp. 653-700.


Recommended Secondary Literature: Ancient and Medieval

PART II: MODERN AND 19TH & 20TH CENTURY PHILOSOPHY

A. Required Selections in Modern Philosophy

Descartes: Meditations (recommended edition: trans. John Cottingham, either in The Philosophical Writings of Descartes or in Meditations on First Philosophy with Selections from the Objections and Replies. Also dependable is the translation by Donald A. Cress in Hackett). Hobbes: Leviathan I and II.

Leibniz: Monadology (recommended translation in: Philosophical Essays, trans. Ariew & Barber in Hackett.)


Locke: An Essay Concerning Human Understanding (Hackett abridged edition by K. Winkler)


Kant: (1) Critique of Pure Reason, (through the Transcendental Dialectic) (recommended edition: trans. Paul Guyer & Allen W. Wood; the translations by N. Kemp Smith and by W. Pluhar are also acceptable); (2) Foundations of the Metaphysics of Morals, Preface, I - III. (Trans. Lewis White Beck)

Hegel: Phenomenology: Preface, Introduction, Sense-Certainty, Lordship and Bondage, The Unhappy Consciousness, and Absolute Knowledge. (A recommended translation with commentary (without the Preface) is: Hegel's Phenomenology of Spirit: Selections, translated and annotated by Howard P. Kainz. A recommended translation with commentary of the preface is found in W. Kaufmann, Hegel: Reinterpretation, Texts, and Commentary. A recommended translation of the whole work is the one by J.B. Baillie, The Phenomenology of Mind. An online version, in a translation by A.V. Miller, is also available.

Mill: Utilitarianism; On Liberty, chaps 1, 2, 4.

B. Required Selections in 19th and 20th Century Continental

Nietzsche: Genealogy of Morals (recommended: trans. W. Kaufmann & Hollingdale)

Kierkegaard: Fear and Trembling (all available translations are acceptable).

Husserl: Cartesian Meditations (trans. D. Cairns)

Heidegger: Being and Time, sections 1-4, 18, 25-27, 29, 31-34, 38, 40, 44, 50-53, 57, 60, 62. (In the translation either of Macquarrie or Stambaugh)


Foucault: The Order of Things, Preface, chapters 1 ("Las Meninas"), 2 ("The Prose of the World"), and 10 ("The Human Sciences").


C. Required Selections in 19th and 20th Century Anglo-American

Peirce: (1) "The Fixation of Belief"; (2) "How to Make Our Ideas Clear" Both In: Ch. S. Peirce, Collected Papers, Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1960, vol. 5

James: Pragmatism


Ayer: Language, Truth, and Logic (2nd ed.). (Introduction, Chapters 1 and 2)

Frege: "On Sense and Reference." In: Translations From the Philosophical Writings of Gottlob Frege, ed. by Peter Geach and Max Black, Oxford, Eng.: Blackwell, 1980


Quine: (1) "Two Dogmas of Empiricism." In: From a Logical Point of View; (2) Word and Object, Chap. 2.
Recommended Secondary Literature:

Modern:

Cambridge Companions (one for each philosopher on the list); Descartes, Hobbes, Leibniz, Spinoza, Locke, Hume, Kant, Hegel, Mill
F. C. Copleston, A History of Philosophy, vols. 4, 5, 6, 7(1)

19th and 20th Century Continental:
Cambridge Companions for Marx, Nietzsche, Husserl, Habermas, Heidegger, Sartre, Foucault, Kierkegaard.
F.C. Copleston, A History of Philosophy, Vol. 7 (2) (Kierkegaard, Nietzsche).
Vincent Descombes, Modern French Philosophy (Merleau-Ponty, Foucault, Derrida).
Herbert Dreyfus, Being-in-the World: A Commentary on Heidegger’s Being and Time. 19th
and 20th Century Anglo-American
Cambridge Companions for Wittgenstein, William James
John Smith, The Spirit of American Philosophy (Peirce, James, Dewey)
John Passmore, A Hundred Years of Philosophy (Russell, Moore, Ayer, Austin, Wittgenstein)

Suggested Reading Lists for Ph.D. Comprehensive Examination, Parts III & IV
Approved by Philosophy Department, April 28, 2000
Please Note: All readings for Parts III and IV are suggested, not required.

Part III: SYSTEMATIC PROBLEMS: METAPHYSICS, EPISTEMOLOGY, AND
PHILOSOPHY OF SCIENCE; PHILOSOPHY OF LANGUAGE, AND LOGIC

A. Metaphysics:
Richard Taylor, Metaphysics (4th ed.)
Martin Heidegger, An Introduction to Metaphysics (trans. Fried and Polt)
Michael Loux, Metaphysics: A Contemporary Introduction
Jaegwon Kim, Philosophy of Mind
Louis Pojman, ed., Philosophy of Religion. An Anthology, sections 1-5

B. Epistemology:
Keith Lehrer, Theory of Knowledge
Articles on memory, introspection, perception, and induction:
1. Memory: entry in Encyclopedia of Philosophy (P. Edwards, ed.)
2. Introspection: Sidney Shoemaker, A First-person Access, in Philosophical Perspectives, vol. 4,
C. Philosophy of Science, Philosophy of Language, and Logic
Robert Hollinger, A. David Kline, E. D. Klemke (Eds), Introductory Readings in the Philosophy of Science (3rd ed.)
Karl-Otto Apel, Selected Essays, (ed. by E. Mendieta), vol. I, essays 1-5
R. I. G. Hughes, A Philosophical Companion to First Order Logic
Ernest Nagel and James R. Newman, Gödel’s Proof
Any good standard logic text of the sort used in Phil 001 such as Hurley, Logic; Kelly, Art of Reasoning; or Copi, Introduction to Logic.

PART IV. SYSTEMATIC PROBLEMS: ETHICS, POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY, AND AESTHETICS.

A. Ethics:
Alasdair MacIntyre, After Virtue, 2nd edition
J. J. C. Smart and Bernard Williams, Utilitarianism. For and Against
Alan Donagan, The Theory of Morality.
John Finnis, Natural Law and Natural Rights, Part II
Peter Singer, ed., A Companion to Ethics
Anthony J. Lisska, Aquinas's Theory of Natural Law. An Analytic Reconstruction

B. Political Philosophy:
John Rawls, A Theory of Justice, part I (complete) and sec. 82
Robert Nozick, Anarchy, State, and Utopia, chapters 1-7
Iris Marion Young, Justice and the Politics of Difference, chapters 1, 5, 6
Michael Sandel, Liberalism and the Limits of Justice
Ronald Dworkin, "Taking Rights Seriously," in Taking Rights Seriously
Charles W. Mills, Blackness Visible: Essays on Philosophy and Race, chapters 2 ("Alternative Epistemologies") and 3 ("But What Are You Really?")
Nancy Tuana and Rosemarie Tong, eds., Feminism and Philosophy: Essential Readings in Theory, Reinterpretation, and Application, chapters 1, 2, 5, and 9
Thomas Gilby, Between Community and Society. A Philosophy and Theology of the State. Philosophy of Law (Following traditional practice, questions in this area may appear either in the section IV.A on Ethics or IV.B on Political Philosophy):
Andrew Altman, Arguing About Law: An Introduction to Legal Philosophy
R. A. Duff and David Garland, A Reader on Punishment (Oxford Readings in Socio-Legal
Supplement: A List of Typical Topics
For Part III:

A. Metaphysics: free will, determinism, fatalism; universals and particulars; God: nature and existence of; causation, first cause, teleology, chance; substance, essence, matter; problem of evil; existence of the external world; the mind/body problem, the soul, immortality; human nature, personhood, personal identity, freedom; identity of physical objects, qualities; space, time, infinity; realism, anti-realism, idealism, materialism, empiricism; nature of the mental; Being vs. beings; History of Being, oblivion of Being; Being and becoming; appearance and reality; being and thinking; Being and the ought

B. Epistemology: analysis of knowledge; truth, theories of (correspondence theory, etc.); foundationalism, coherentism, reliabilism; phenomenalism; scepticism; theory of abstraction; social epistemology; memory; testimony; belief; epistemic justification; a priori knowledge; introspection; perception; induction (Hume’s problem and the “new riddle”); naturalized epistemology

C. Philosophy of Science: explanation and prediction; confirmation; the science/non-science distinction; the observational/theoretical distinction; scientific realism vs. scientific anti-realism; the nature and structure of scientific theories; theoretical reduction; relativism and paradigms; induction; inference to the best explanation; objectivity, values and theory change; science, teleology, and functionalism; the relation of science to metaphysics (e.g., the void, atomism, etc.)

D. Philosophy of Language: meaning; intention; convention; reference; speech acts/performatives; proper names; propositional attitudes; private language; fictional discourse; metaphor; intensionality/extensionality; demonstratives and indexicals; analyticity

E. Logic and Philosophy of Logic: the laws of contradiction, the excluded middle, and identity; logical paradoxes; the viability of modal and deviant logics; logic and ontology; existential import; Russell’s theory of types; Russell’s theory of descriptions; Gödel’s theorems; logical truth; the justifiability of deduction; the nature of proof; mathematics, logic, and set theory: their relations

For Part IV:
A. Ethics: psychological and rational egoism; realism and relativism; deontology; consequentialism; utilitarianism; natural law theory; virtue theory; issues in business ethics;
bioethics; nuclear deterrence theory; abortion; euthanasia; affirmative action; the principle of double effect and various applications of it; environmental ethics; sexual ethics; the ethics of war and peace; methods of justification in ethics, e.g., coherentism and foundationalism.

B. Political Philosophy: social contract theory; anarchism; conservatism; socialism; libertarianism; liberalism; communitarianism, Marxism; feminism; multiculturalism; theories of political obligation; autonomy; democracy; distributive justice; liberty; equality; property; power; theories of rights; welfare; the state; efficiency; totalitarianism; secession and nationalism; federalism; republicanism.

C. Philosophy of Law (Following traditional practice, topics in this area may appear either in the section IV.A on Ethics or IV.B on Political Philosophy): theories of law e.g., natural law theory, legal positivism, law as integrity, critical legal studies, critical race theory, formalism, legal realism, the economic approach to law, feminist jurisprudence; philosophical issues in criminal law, e.g., theories of punishment: retributivism, deterrence theory, rehabilitation; criminal liability; philosophical issues in civil law: e.g., torts, property; philosophical issues in constitutional law, e.g., liberty and its limits: speech and privacy; race, equality, and the constitution.

D. Aesthetics: definition of a work of art; nature and evaluative import of forgery; censorship; metaphor; the logic of fictional discourse; ontology of fictional characters, objects, etc., definition of literature; the role of the author’s/artist’s intentions in interpretation/evaluation; validity in interpretation; the ontology of art; feminism and art; multiculturalism and art; general canons of aesthetic evaluation; the nature of beauty; the aesthetics of nature; definition of aesthetic experience; the nature of aesthetic properties; aesthetic relativism; the relation of aesthetic judgment to moral judgment; cognitive and affective theories of aesthetic value; the justification of aesthetic interests; the relation of art to the aesthetic; the nature of pictorial representation.