**For our last meeting (4/27):** I will bring a final exam question about Trakakis’s essay (reading #8 on the syllabus), and we will discuss the essay and how to answer the question. I’m thinking that for that essay, the best question would be a fairly open-ended one, asking for an explanation of what Trakakis takes theodicies to be, what he thinks is wrong with the project of constructing theodicies, and the highlights of his case for his negative conclusion, and then asks you to evaluate his argument.

**An attempt at writing without philosopher-speak:**

Adams argues that if you would be free in a situation, it must be the case that you might do the right thing if you were put in that situation, and also that you might not. But that you might do the right thing in that situation is inconsistent with it being the case that you won’t do the right thing in it. And that you might not do the right thing in the situation is inconsistent with it being the case that you will do the right thing in it. So, neither the claim that you will do the right thing if put in the situation, nor the claim that you won’t, can be true. [So even God, though omniscient, can’t know what an agent will do in situations in which they are free.]

**Engaging in a bit of philosopher-speak:**

Adams argues that neither

a. If A is in situation S, A will do x

nor

b. If A is in situation S, A will not do x

is true where S is a situation in which S is free to do x or not to do it, because, Adams argues, both of these must be true if S is free with respect to doing x in S:

c. If A is in situation S, A might do x

d. If A is in situation S, A might not do x

and (c) incompatible with (b) and (d) is incompatible with (a).

If you go the philosopher-speak route, you may find it best to introduce the likes of (a) and (b) already in explaining what Middle Knowledge is in the first place, before you get to the arguments against it – in which case you can just refer back to them.

