

Review Sheet -- Exam II

The purpose of this sheet is to provide a brief list of learning objectives for the exam. It focuses principally on the sorts of material that will be covered on the longer essays and in some of the sort essay questions. It is not meant to cover all material assigned in the readings. The readings for the final are those listed in the email I sent to you recently. Remember the final will cover only the material from Unit IIIA and Unit IIIC as indicated in the file attached to this email.

**Some shorter questions will definitely focus on material assigned in reading but not covered in class.**

Unit IIIA: The Distinction between Mind and Body — Successful study of material for this unit means that you should be able to:

1. Set forth the classical argument for a distinction between the soul and body including the distinction between reason and sensation; the distinction between connotative and denotative definitions; why our ability to answer the question ‘what is x?’ implies that reason apprehends the natures of things; the distinction between the natures of material things and those things the principle of like know like and how it provides the basis for arguing that the rational activity of the soul must be immaterial.
2. Set forth, compare and contrast the respective views of Plato, Aristotle, Aquinas and Churchland as to the nature of the difference, if any, between the mind/soul and body. You should be prepared to discuss the nature of this difference, if any.

You should be able to discuss, compare and contrast, the views of these thinkers on the relation of the soul to the body:

Plato’s view that the soul and body are separate substances, of which the individual Socrates is essentially his soul;

Aristotle’s understanding of the individual as a hylomorphic composite: hence the different kinds of soul; the relation between matter and form and act and potency, Aristotle’s position that the soul is not separable from the body..

Aquinas’s view that the individual is a composite of soul and body while the rational soul has a substantial existence apart from the body;

In the case of Plato, Aristotle and Aquinas you should be able to indicate whether or not they believe that humans can have individual immortality and what would be the nature of this immortality. So why Plato argues for personal immortality of the soul alone; why Aristotle rejects personal immortality; why Aquinas argues for personal immortality for the soul and body.

In the case of Churchland, you should be able to set forth the arguments from religion and introspection that he cites in favor of dualism as well as his criticism of those arguments You should be able to define substance dualism, property dualism, and materialism (in the class notes for unit IIIA).(You can ignore the class notes for unit IIIA that deal with other topics in Churchland).

**UNIT IIIC(the role of reason in human life) Successful study of material for this unit means that you should be able to**

**For Aristotle and Plato:**

1. know the definitions provided in the notes for this unit.
2. set forth Aristotle's conception of the relation between happiness and human nature, the formal nature of happiness as the final end of human life, and why specifically Aristotle thinks that happiness consists in activity in conformity with reason.
3. explain why Aristotle believe that happiness cannot consist in wealth, pleasure and fame.
4. explain why Aristotle would defend the claim that the best lived life is the philosophical life.
5. explain why Socrates (in the *Phaedo*) thinks that philosophy is a rehearsal for death and, accordingly, why the best life is a philosophical life (you are responsible for this material. It was not covered in class).
6. explain why someone (e.g.,) a fundamentalist might reject the claim that a philosophical life is the best life in light of a different understanding than Aristotle's of the ultimate end and nature of human life.

**For material on Zen Buddhism you should be able to discuss these issues:**

1. The article by D.T. Suzuki:
  - a) Define or characterize the following terms: freedom; suffering; problem of problems; buddahood (p. 10)
  - b) What does S mean by command to choose between the 'everlasting no' and the 'everlasting yes.' What examples of this can you give in Christian or Western experience (e.g., "Let Thy will be done.")
  - c) why does life essentially involve suffering; how is the ego-centered character of life connected with and a cause of suffering;
  - d) What is meant by the 'problem of problems' (that is, the struggle between the finite/infinite; or flesh/spirit; intellect/higher power)
  - e) how does Zen deal with the problem of problems: why does S critique the idea that reason can solve the problem of problems; in what way does the solution lie in person, directly experience of life; what is meant by the analogy of the 'finger pointing to the moon.' Why is it important not to confuse the finger with the moon.; why does Suzuki think the formulation of the problem of problems as a struggle between the finite and infinite is an illusion;
  - f) what is meant by saying that "Zen never explains but indicates."
2. Geoffrey Arnold "The Freedom of No Escape"
  - a) define or characterize: 'grass'; 'gates'
  - b) what is meant by 'go where there is no grass for 10 thousand miles'
  - c) We hunt for a place with no anger, attachments, no injustice, etc. What is wrong with viewing this a 'place' to which we can escape.
  - d) in what way are 'expectations,' concepts', attachments' and desires causes of suffering and delusion (this is a topic in Suzuki as well); in what way in the mind in general the source of delusion and suffering; why does Zen aim for a 'place' where 'no thought arises'? What is meant by this phrase or the phrase 'forgetting the self.' Why is the idea that we can somehow go this place a delusion and misunderstanding?
  - e) what is meant by 'even by not going outside the gate, the grass is boundless'?
  - f) In what way is this a summation of what Zen 'seeks':  
"Grass boundless inside the gate, outside the gate, you see by yourself. When the grass is boundless both inside and outside the gate, then the gate becomes meaningless, there is no

boundary separating one place from another. So it is for anything that we perceive as separated from another. To go beyond all notions of divisions and edges is our practice.”

For the material on the Heart and Hesychasm by Kallistos Ware,

For the article “What is the Heart and What do We Find when We Enter” you should be able to discuss these issues: [YOU ARE NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR THIS ARTICLE OR THE NOTES FOR IT.]

For the material from The Art of Prayer, you should be able to: discuss these issues

- 1) How is ‘standing before God’ connected with the goal of getting the mind into the heart?
  - 2) what is the difference between the body, soul, and spirit? What are their special ways of knowing?
  - 3) What is the relation of the heart to the mind, soul and spirit?
  - 4) Why must the intellect descend into the heart to have a direct experience of God. Why can we not have such an experience with the mind by itself (in the head)?
- Don’t worry about the material from 21-27 in this article EXCEPT for the second full paragraph on page 25 “Do not permit yourself any concepts, images, ...” For this paragraph you should be able to understand the notion of pure prayer: what it is and why it is recommended.

---

You should be prepared for some compare and contrast questions:

- 1) For Aristotle, we are by nature rational, where ‘reason’ means acting and thinking in terms of universal principles. We can’t be truly happy or live well without actualizing our capacity to think and act rationally. How would Zen and the Hesychast (Eastern Orthodox) tradition regard this claim. Do the Zen and Hesychast traditions give similar responses? If not, how do they differ from one another.
- 2) Zen and the Hesychast tradition gives primacy to direct immediate experience. Compare and contrast what each means by this. Ditto with their critique of reason.
- 3) The Hesychast tradition distinguishes between body, mind, spirit and heart. Do we find similar distinctions for Aristotle, for Zen?