

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON
M PHIL EXAMINATIONS 2004
for internal students

EPISTEMOLOGY AND METHODOLOGY

Candidates should answer **THREE** of the following questions. Please avoid overlap in your answers.

1. Why do our observations confirm the hypothesis that all emeralds are green, rather than the hypothesis that all emeralds are grue?
2. What is it to have a justified belief?
3. 'Inductive justifications of induction are circular, therefore they are inadequate.' Discuss.
4. 'Our knowledge of our beliefs is grounded in a reliable causal mechanism connecting our beliefs to our beliefs about our beliefs.' Discuss.
5. Is a mere experience ever sufficient for perceptual knowledge?
6. Is it possible to acquire knowledge via memory in the absence of reasons for believing one's memory is reliable?
7. 'I know a priori that I have the concept water. I know a priori that if I have the concept water then water exists. Therefore, I know a priori that water exists.' Discuss.
8. Does contextualism about knowledge provide a satisfactory answer to scepticism?
9. What are the defining commitments of Bayesianism? How might they be justified?
10. 'All good explanations are causal explanations.' Discuss.
11. Is the 'pessimistic meta-induction from past falsity' a good argument against scientific realism?
12. Can an account of the analyticity of sentences be developed in such a way as to throw light on the problem of a priori knowledge?

TURN OVER

13. What is it for an informant to be trustworthy? Do I need to have evidence that my informant is trustworthy in order to acquire knowledge through testimony?

END OF PAPER