

Phil 101 — Final Exam

Spring 2022

General Instructions—PLEASE READ!!!

On the front of *every* exam book you use, please provide the following information:

Your name (obviously)

That this is an exam book for Phil 101 (obviously)

Your TA's name

"This is exam book 1 of 3 [or however many you use]." "This is exam book 2 of 3," and so on.

On the front of *your first* exam book, please also provide the following information:

"I used Exam ID # _____."

You *must* return this copy of the exam to us before you leave. We also want to confirm that you have provided all the information requested above, before you leave.

It is *very much* in your interest to **write legibly**. You'll suffer for bad handwriting (your grader will not be able to spend lots of time trying to figure out what you're trying to say). Also, please don't try to save exam books. Don't try to cram lots of writing onto each page. Leave generous white space. Those who have bad handwriting should especially heed this advice.

You may consult a single page of your own notes during the exam. Also, make sure it's **always clear which question you're trying to answer** at each point in your exam book.

There are three parts (A, B, C) and a total of 100 points on the exam.

Part A (10 points)

Extract and summarize the argument from *one* (and *only* one) of the following passages, in your own words. (Suggested length: we expect around 10 sentences should be enough.)

What conclusion is the author trying to establish in the passage? What position are they trying to defend or to criticize? What premises or assumptions are they relying on? Explain how they think those premises help support their conclusion. If one of the author's premises, or their conclusion, can be understood in more than one way, you should say so, and explain the difference between the different interpretations.

Be as clear and specific as you can. Also, stay focused on the specific passage. Tell us what *it* is arguing. You don't have to tell us what reading it came from, or what the larger paper was about. Nor should you try to show us *how much you know* about the relevant philosophical issues. Just tell us what's going on in the specific passage you chose.

If you know how to summarize arguments as a numbered list of premises and conclusions, saying why (according to the passage) the conclusions are supposed to follow, it's okay to do that here. But you don't have to; this is just an option that some of you may be familiar with.

We do *not* want you to evaluate or criticize these arguments. We just want you to tell us what the argument in the passage *is*. Also, we do not want a line-by-line paraphrase of the passage. You should be able to summarize the argument in your own words, and tell us what its highlights are.

THIS WILL BE LIKE THE SECOND (EXEGETICAL/EXPOSITORY) WRITING ASSIGNMENTS WE DID AT THE START OF TERM.

Part B (30 points)

Answer each of the following questions with a few sentences. They are worth 5 points each.

SAMPLE-B1. In discussions of free will, one encounters a distinction between the psychological process of deliberating and *making* a choice, on the one hand (“It didn’t just happen to me: I chose it!”), and having several choices really *open* to one, on the other. Give some brief examples to explain this distinction.

SAMPLE-B2. What is the relation or difference between a mental state, a mind, and a soul?

SAMPLE-B3. Does quasi-remembering something entail that you are not identical to the person it happened to?

THERE WILL BE A TOTAL OF SIX QUESTIONS HERE.

Part C (60 points)

Answer each of the following questions. They are worth 10 points each. (Suggested length: generally we’re expecting it should be possible to answer these using 5-10 sentences, though depending on what you want to say you may sometimes need more.)

Answer the specific questions asked, and be concise. Don’t attempt to write down everything you know about a term or issue. Since this is a philosophy exam, we expect you to give some reasons and arguments in support of your answers.

SAMPLE-C1. Alex hopes to be married someday, but he doesn’t yet know who (if anybody) will be his future spouse. After taking Phil 101, Alex reasons like this: I don’t know who my future spouse is; but I do know who all my current acquaintances are. So by Leibniz’s Law, my future spouse must be someone I’m not yet acquainted with. Explain the mistake in Alex’s reasoning.

SAMPLE-C2. Some dualists don’t accept the same-soul theory of personal identity, but instead hold one of the other views we discussed. What can you say to explain why they’re allowed to do that, and why might they want to?

SAMPLE-C3. What does it mean for a property to be essential? Consider the claim that you are essentially alive. Would that be the same as saying you are immortal? What is the relation between Feldman’s Termination Thesis and the claim that you are essentially alive: Does either of them entail that the other is true? That the other is false? Neither?

THERE WILL BE A TOTAL OF SIX QUESTIONS HERE.