1. Why can’t Schneider stop his hand just before grasping his nose and thereby point to it? What does this tell us about motor intentionality? Why is the Schneider case important in understanding the role of the body in perception?

2. What is the empiricist understanding of attention? What is the intellectualist understanding of attention? What are Merleau-Ponty’s objections to these two accounts? (Is there any common mistake they are both making?) What is Merleau-Ponty’s alternative understanding of attention, and why does he believe it to be true? (What is the evidence, argument and/or justification?) What do you think is the most forceful objection to Merleau-Ponty’s account of attention (either from the intellectualist, empiricist, or your own objection)?

3. What are the two traditional ways of understanding phantom limbs that Merleau-Ponty discusses? What is wrong with these accounts, according to Merleau-Ponty? What is Merleau-Ponty’s understanding of phantom limbs and why does this matter to his phenomenology? If Merleau-Ponty is correct about the failure of scientific explanations, and if his explanation is satisfactory, what are the philosophical implications?

4. What is the empiricist account the role of the past in perception? What is Merleau-Ponty’s objection(s) to it? What is Merleau-Ponty’s alternative for how past experience figures in perception? What would be some objections (either your own and/or from the empiricists) to Merleau-Ponty’s view?

5. An important problem in traditional philosophy and modern science is how to explain the difference between movements of human bodies that are merely effects of outside forces (e.g., slipping on ice) and those that are caused by the humans themselves (e.g., ice skating on ice). Generally, explanations of these two different types of bodily movement make use of the notion of reason and cause. Discuss Merleau-Ponty’s arguments against the notions of reason and cause as insufficient for explaining normal, everyday intentional body movement, and whether or not his arguments are sound.

6. According to Merleau-Ponty, what sort of inner experiences, if any, does one have on the level of motor intentionality? That is, when one is acting in flow. Do you agree? If not, what do you think he is leaving out?
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