

Review Sheet -- Examination 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. **Some shorter questions will focus on material assigned in reading but not covered in class.** Also remember that the purpose of the exam is for you to show me that you understand the material covered in class. Displaying this understanding means that you can recognize and define critical terms and that you can give adequate and precise reasons for positions that you assert or that you attribute to others.

Please note that there are many terms that have been defined for all of this material. You should, of course, know the definition of all the terms given on the notes for these units that are posted on the web.

This exam will cover the readings and material covered in Units IIIA and B. For IIIA: Plato, Meno 70-75A and Phaedo, 65B-67B (these are the numbers in the margins of the page); Aristotle and Aquinas (on e-reserve), and Churchland (the arguments for/against dualism relating to religion and introspection); the notes for IIIA on the website. For IIIB, the reading by Alston and Brandt as well as the notes for unit IIIB.

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).

For Unit IIIB: Rationalism and Empiricism— Successful study of material for this unit means that you should be able to

1. Define and discuss the difference between: rationalism and empiricism, a priori and a posteriori knowledge; universal, necessary, particular, and contingent knowledge, and analytic knowledge.
2. Set forth the principal argument for rationalism: that universal and necessary knowledge of reality can not be derived from sense experience since all general knowledge from such experience is based upon inductive generalization. Explain why in light of this criticism, the empiricist will either reject the idea of universal and necessary knowledge or restrict such knowledge to analytic knowledge.
3. Set forth the empiricist criticism that people use sensible examples in obtaining mathematical knowledge and, hence, that it is not a priori unless it is analytical. Set forth the rationalist distinction between using examples to illustrate mathematical knowledge and deriving such knowledge from sensible examples. In this connection you should be able to explain why a empirical experiments play a decisive role in scientific knowledge and why such experiments are absent from mathematical knowledge.