

**M.A. EXAMINATION 2004**

for Internal Students

**PHILOSOPHY****General Philosophy**

Wednesday, 26 May 2004: 10.00 - 1.00.

Answer THREE questions. Questions should be chosen from AT LEAST TWO sections. Avoid overlap in your answers.

You may NOT take questions from an area which is the subject of either of your other two papers. Please write the titles of your other two papers at the top of your answer paper.

**SECTION A: EPISTEMOLOGY AND METHODOLOGY**

1. Is it possible to explain why Gettier cases are not cases of knowledge?
2. Are there cases of justified true belief which are not cases of knowledge? Are there cases of knowledge which are not cases of justified true belief?
3. EITHER (a) What, in your opinion, is the strongest reason for being a sceptic about the external world? What, if anything, is wrong with that reason?  
  
OR (b) Does the possibility of dreaming show that we do not know that there is an external world?
4. What is the Humean problem of induction and how, if at all, can it be solved?
5. EITHER (a) What is 'new' about Goodman's new riddle of induction? How does it differ from Hume's problem?  
  
OR (b) Is there any basis on which to disallow inductive inferences involving the predicate 'grue'?

**SECTION B: ETHICS**

6. EITHER (a) How, and how well, does Mill argue for the Principle of Utility in 'Utilitarianism'?

OR (b) Is Mill's case for the ascription of rights a genuinely Utilitarian one?

**TURN OVER**

7. EITHER (a) 'Given that the people in the State of Nature can know the Laws of Nature, according to Hobbes, they could choose to act as those Laws require, in which case the State of Nature need not be a state of war.' Discuss.

OR (b) Expound and critically assess Hobbes's view of moral motivation.

8. Could there be moral experts?

9. Does moral relativism provide a convincing explanation of the diversity of moral opinion?

10. EITHER (a) Can the commitment expressed by a sincere utterance of 'Hitler was evil' be understood on the model of that expressed by a sincere utterance of 'Hitler was Austrian'?

OR (b) Why does Mackie think that moral facts would be impossibly 'queer', and is he right?

SECTION C: LOGIC AND METAPHYSICS

11. Does Frege's notion of sense provide **the only** satisfactory solution to Frege's puzzle **about identity**?

12. EITHER (a) Are there any a posteriori necessary truths?

OR (b) What is philosophically important about the notion of rigid designation?

13. Is Quine right to deny that there are two kinds of truth - empirical and non-empirical?

14. What, if anything, do our intuitions about brain-swap and brain-division cases reveal about personal identity?

15. **'If a had not occurred b would not have occurred.'** How close is this to saying **that a caused b**?

SECTION D: POLITICAL PHILOSOPHY

16. Assess the strengths and weaknesses of the original position as a device for generating principles of justice.
17. Is the difference principle too egalitarian or not egalitarian enough?
18. Does liberty upset patterns?
19. What is the role of a proviso on acquisition in a theory of justice?
20. Does Mill's case for the liberty principle rule out all paternalism?

## SECTION E: SYMBOLIC LOGIC

21. Answer all parts of this question. The maximum mark for each part is indicated in square brackets.

### Part I.

- (a) Can a sound argument be invalid? If it can, give an example.
  - (b) Is the following argument valid: 'Tony Blair is an alien. If Tony Blair is an alien, David Blunkett is as well. Therefore, David Blunkett is an alien.'?
  - (c) What role do appeal to a grammar or syntax play in defining the scope of a logical connective?
  - (d) Can an invalid argument have a true conclusion? If it can, give an example.
- [4 marks]**

### Part II.

Give definitions of the following:

- (a) Deductive proof
- (b) Logical equivalence

**[2 marks]**

### Part III.

Use a formal method to show that the following argument is valid:

Moriarty will appear in disguise or not at all. Unless Moriarty appears in disguise, Watson will be in trouble. So, if Watson's not in trouble, Moriarty will appear in disguise.

**[4 marks]**

### Part IV.

- (i) Translate the following into first-order predicate calculus ('Predicate' in Guttenplan). In each case, provide a key or interpretation for your use of symbols.
  - (a) No man is an island. Therefore, no island is a man.
  - (b) Some philosophers disagree with every philosopher. Therefore, some philosophers disagree with themselves.
  - (c) Everyone who is sane can do logic. No one who is insane is employable. None of my family can do logic. Therefore, none of my family is employable.
  - (d) It's not the case that there are exactly two great logicians.

**[8 marks]**

- (ii) Show that each of (i) (a), (i) (b), and (i) (c) is valid.

**[6 marks]**

- (iii) Briefly discuss each of the following:

- (a) The notion of formal validity.
- (b) The relationship between consistency and validity.

(c) The translation of English 'or' by disjunction.

**[9 marks]**

**END OF PAPER**