

**UNIVERSITY OF LONDON**

**BA EXAMINATION 2006**

for Internal Students

This paper is also taken by Combined Studies Students

**PHILOSOPHY**

2. Epistemology and Methodology

Answer THREE questions. Avoid overlap in your answers.

1. Are there any good reasons to believe that the concept of knowledge cannot be analysed?
2. 'I know that there is a piece of paper in front of me, and know that it would not be possible for me to know this if I were dreaming. So I know that I am not dreaming.' Discuss.
3. Does the observation that knowledge ascriptions are context-sensitive provide the basis for a satisfactory response to scepticism?
4. 'For a potential knowledge source K to yield knowledge for a person S it isn't enough that K is reliable; S must also know that K is reliable.' Is this true?
5. Can a belief be justified by something other than another belief?
6. EITHER (a) 'The belief that P is justified for S if and only if S's belief that P is epistemically responsible.' Does this claim undermine externalist conceptions of epistemic justification?  
  
OR (b) What is an externalist theory of knowledge? Should we be externalists about knowledge?
7. 'I can see the rain without knowing that it is raining, but I can't see that it is raining without knowing that it is raining.' Discuss.

**TURN OVER**

8. 'One sees the aeroplane overhead in virtue of seeing its underside.' Are there any good reasons for supposing that this is true? What bearing would its truth have on whether we see physical objects directly?
9. 'Our sense experiences result from patterns of brain stimulation. The very same pattern of brain stimulation could have been produced in the absence of any physical objects in a person's environment. Therefore the same experiences can occur when we merely have hallucinations as when we perceive objects in the world around us.' Assess the validity of this argument and the significance of its conclusion.
10. 'The only way of reconciling self-knowledge and externalism about the concept water is to accept that I know *a priori* that water exists.' Discuss.
11. If S comes to know that P by some speaker N telling S that P, must S have made an assessment of N's credibility?
12. '*A priori* knowledge is any knowledge whose source is non-perceptual.' Discuss.
13. 'Induction can be justified by an inductive argument because only premise circularity is vicious circularity.' Explain and discuss.
14. Can we use the concept of naturalness to solve the grue problem?
15. Is there a satisfactory solution to the paradox of the ravens?
16. What role, if any, do laws play in scientific explanations?
17. Why, if at all, should astrology be regarded as unscientific?
18. EITHER (a) Does acceptance of a scientific theory require belief that the theory is true?  
OR (b) Can a scientific anti-realist account for the success of science?
19. 'You should believe the hypothesis which makes your evidence more likely.' Discuss.

**END OF PAPER**