

UNIVERSITY OF MALTA
FACULTY OF ARTS



JUNE 2012 SESSION EXAMINATIONS

PHI3010 Synoptic Study-Unit I: Philosophy
for

B.A., B.A.(Hons.), B.Comm. (Hons.), B.A. Th. & H.S.

Saturday 9th June 2012

9.15 – 12.15

NO DICTIONARIES ALLOWED

Answer any three questions.

1. What arguments does Socrates use in Plato's *Republic* to show that justice is to be preferred over injustice?
2. How does Aristotle analyse change?
3. "Medieval philosophy involves a dialogue with and a transformation of philosophical problems that trace their ancestry back to Plato and Aristotle." Discuss.
4. Augustine and Thomas Aquinas both tried to understand the relationship between reason and faith. Outline and discuss their views about the nature of this relationship.
5. How does Descartes move from an initial position of universal doubt to one of certainty in the *Meditations*?
6. Discuss Hume's views on causality.
7. Outline and discuss the key concepts of both hermeneutical and critical theory.
8. Can the traditional gap dividing analytic and continental philosophy be bridged? If yes, how? If not, why not?



PHI3011 Synoptic Study-Unit II: Philosophy
for

B.A., B.Comm. (Hons.), B.A. Th. & H.S.

Monday 18th June 2012

9.15 – 12.15

NO DICTIONARIES ALLOWED

Answer one question from Section A and two from Section B.

Section A

- (i) *A list of logical rules is appended to this examination paper to assist candidates.*
(ii) *Always give reasons for your answer.*
1. a. (i) $a \leftrightarrow b$ is defined as $(a \vee \neg b) \wedge (\neg a \vee b)$. Work out its truth-table.
(ii) Show by means of a truth-table that $a \leftrightarrow b$ and $\neg(a \sqcup b)$ are equivalent.
(iii) Find out by means of a truth-table whether $A \rightarrow B$, $A < B$ is valid.
(iv) What is the name of the standard implication in (iii) above?
(v) Find out by means of a truth-table whether \wedge is distributive over \rightarrow ; i.e. whether $A \wedge (B \rightarrow C) \succ (A \wedge B) \rightarrow (A \wedge C)$ is valid.
- b. In Effective Logic, no two of the three classically equivalent propositions $a \rightarrow b$, $\neg a \vee b$ and $\neg(a \wedge \neg b)$ are equivalent. Write these propositions in order, starting from the strongest and ending with the weakest.
- c. Given that propositions **a** and **b** are not truth-definite, state without proving, which, if any, of the following arguments is/are (i) effectively and/or (ii) classically sound.
- (i) $\neg\neg a < a$
(ii) $a < \neg\neg a$
(iii) $\neg b \rightarrow \neg a < a \rightarrow b$
(iv) $a \rightarrow b < \neg b \rightarrow \neg a$
(v) $a \rightarrow b < \neg a \rightarrow \neg b$
(vi) $a \rightarrow b < \neg\neg b \rightarrow \neg\neg a$
- d. Find out by means of an effective scenario tableau whether the argument $a \vee b < \neg(\neg a \wedge \neg b)$ is effectively sound. (**a** and **b** are not truth-definite.)
- e. Find out by means of dialogues whether the argument $\neg(\neg a \wedge \neg b) < a \vee b$ is effectively and/or classically sound. (**a** and **b** are not truth-definite.)
- f. **Either**

Find out by means of a Beth tableau whether the argument $(a \wedge b) \vee (a \wedge c) < a \wedge (b \vee c)$ is classically sound.

Or

Find out by means of a dialogue-based development whether the argument $\neg(a \wedge b), a < \neg b$ is effectively and/or classically sound. (a and b are not truth-definite.)

- g. Give the simple and/or accidental converse, if any, of :
- No man is wise.
 - All men are wise.
- h. Within Classical Logic ‘proposition P is subcontrary to proposition Q’ means $\neg P < Q$ is sound. What do the following mean?
- P is contrary to Q.
 - P is contradictory to Q.
- i. Show by means of a Beth tableau that if the subject term S is nonempty, the proposition SiP is subcontrary to SoP i.e. that $\forall_x S(x), \neg \forall_x .S(x) \wedge P(x). < \forall_x .S(x) \wedge \neg P(x)$.
- j. Show by means of a Beth tableau that the 2nd figure syllogism *Baroco* is classically sound.
2. a. (i) $a \sqcup b$ is defined as $(a \wedge \neg b) \vee (\neg a \wedge b)$. Work out its truth-table.
- Show by means of a truth-table that $a \sqcup b$ and $\neg(a \leftrightarrow b)$ are equivalent.
 - By means of a truth-table show that the Affirming the Consequent is fallacious, i.e. that $A \rightarrow B, B < A$ is invalid.
 - Find out by means of a truth-table whether the following Contraposition is valid : $A \rightarrow (B \vee C) >> \neg B \rightarrow (\neg A \vee C)$.
- b. (i) Given that the proposition a is not truth-definite, state without proving, whether each of the following propositions is (i) effective and/or (ii) classically true.
- $a \vee \neg a$
 - $\neg(a \wedge \neg a)$
- (ii) Give the standard name for each of the two propositions in b (i) above.
- c. In Effective Logic, the two classically equivalent propositions $a \vee b$ and $\neg(\neg a \wedge \neg b)$ are not equivalent. One who receives $a \vee b$ is able to assert about the ‘original’ sender something more than if one had instead received $\neg(\neg a \wedge \neg b)$. Explain in three or four lines.
- d. Find out by means of an effective scenario tableau whether the argument $\neg a \vee b < a \rightarrow b$ is effectively sound. (a and b are not truth-definite.)
- e. Find out by means of dialogues whether the argument $\neg(a \wedge b) < \neg a \vee \neg b$ is effectively and/or classically sound. (a and b are not truth-definite.)
- f. **Either**
Find out by means of a Beth tableau whether the argument $(a \vee b) \wedge (a \vee c) < a \vee (b \wedge c)$ is classically sound.

Or

Find out by means of a dialogue-based development whether the argument $a \vee b \text{ ,, } \neg a < b$ is effectively and/or classically sound. (a and b are not truth-definite.)

g. Write down:

- (i) the contradictory, if any, of “Some man is wise”.
- (ii) the contrary, if any, of “Some man is wise”.
- (iii) the subcontrary, if any, of “Some man is wise”.
- (iv) the superaltern, if any, of “Some man is wise”.

h. Within Classical Logic, “proposition R is contrary to proposition S” means that $R < \neg S$ is sound. What do the following mean?

- (i) R is subcontrary to S.
- (ii) R is contradictory to S.

i. Show by means of a Beth tableau that if the predicate term P is occupied, the proposition SeP can be converted accidentally to the proposition PoS i.e.

$$\forall_x .P(x) \text{ ,, } \bigwedge_x .S(x) \rightarrow \neg P(x) < \forall_x .P(x) \wedge \neg S(x).$$

j. Show by means of a Beth tableau that the 1st figure syllogism *Ferio* is classically sound.

Section B

3. Either (a) Discuss the *objectivist* and *subjectivist* meaning of moral goodness.

Or (b) Do death and birth reveal the purpose of man?

4. Either (a) Discuss Aristotle’s influence on Thomas Aquinas in the field of ethics.

Or (b) “According to Kant, the morally good person is the one who strives to do what he *ought* to do rather than the one who acts either from *inclination* or *self-interest*.” Discuss.

5. Either (a) What is Aristotle’s general theory of sense perception and how are the five senses related to it?

Or (b) Outline and discuss Kant’s attempt to provide a synthesis of rational thought and sense experience.

6. Language has been described as “our most sophisticated and our most important unique possession”. Why do philosophers attribute such importance to it?

7. In Donald Davidson's famous example, someone alerts a burglar by illuminating a room, which he does by turning on a light, which he does by flipping the appropriate switch. How many actions does such an agent perform and why?

8. “The role of the state is perhaps the dominant theme of political disagreement, reflecting different views about the proper relationship between the state and the individual.” Discuss.

9. Compare and contrast the views of Hobbes and Locke on the so-called 'state of nature' and the establishment of civil society.
10. Either (a) Discuss Thomas Kuhn's account of the development of scientific paradigms with particular reference to the validity of the criticism that it is relativistic and that it introduces an element of irrationality in the scientists' decision to shift from one paradigm to another.

Or (b) How successful was Imre Lakatos' 'Methodology of Scientific Research Programmes' in reaching its aim to "explain and further strengthen Popper's sophisticated falsification and present scientific revolutions not as constituting religious conversions but rather as rational progress"?
11. Either (a) What is Metaphysics? How would you explain the fact that Aristotle's insights in this field have remained of great interest to so many thinkers throughout the ages?

Or (b) Explain Aristotle's distinction between potency and act and show its relevance to his argument for the existence of God.
12. Show how Thomas Aquinas structures *each* of his *Five Ways* by discussing in detail *any one* of these five demonstrations for the existence of God.
13. "Though all attempts to define art in terms of necessary and sufficient conditions turn out in the end to be unsatisfactory, we can still learn a lot about the value of art from the theories that seek to defend such definitions." Discuss with reference to either two or three of the following: (a) art as representation; (b) art as expression; (c) art as form; (d) art as institution.
14. "The linear or transmission model of communication needs to be framed within a context." Discuss.
15. Why do philosophers feel that they need to provide an explanation of the mind-body problem? Critically discuss this issue and illustrate your answer with reference to the various attempts which philosophers have proposed to resolve this problem.
16. Critically discuss the manner in which John McDowell attempts to 'dissolve' the duality of mind and world through the introduction of the concept of 'second nature'.



JUNE 2012 SESSION EXAMINATIONS

PHI3111 Synoptic Study-Unit II: Philosophy

Saturday 16th June 2012

9.15 – 12.15

NO DICTIONARIES ALLOWED

Answer ONE question.

1. “Metaphysics attempts to provide a rational explanation for why things in nature are the way they are by seeking to give a *causal* account of how things come to be.” Discuss and elucidate this statement.

Is there a ‘necessary connection’ between causes and their effects? Are there laws of nature? Give reasons for your answer.

Taking *at least one* philosophical text you have read as your main point of reference, argue whether philosophy can do without some form of metaphysical speculation.

2. “To ask: ‘Who made the universe?’ is a perfectly legitimate question. But to ask: ‘Who made God?’ is to show that you have not yet grasped the concept ‘God’.” Explain this statement with reference to any argument for the existence of God.

How useful are ancient and mediaeval metaphysics in attempting to demonstrate the existence of God? Is it possible to find other avenues in modern or contemporary philosophy which could contribute towards such an undertaking? What could more traditional arguments still tell us in this regard?

How would a philosopher account for the presence of disorder and evil in the universe?



JUNE 2012 SESSION EXAMINATIONS

PHI3012 Synoptic Study-Unit III : Philosophy

Monday 18th June 2012

9.15 – 12.15

NO DICTIONARIES ALLOWED

Answer three questions, one from each section.

Section A

- (iii) *A list of logical rules is appended to this examination paper to assist candidates.*
(iv) *Always give reasons for your answer.*
2. a. (i) $a \leftrightarrow b$ is defined as $(a \vee \neg b) \wedge (\neg a \vee b)$. Work out its truth-table.
(ii) Show by means of a truth-table that $a \leftrightarrow b$ and $\neg(a \sqcup b)$ are equivalent.
(iii) Find out by means of a truth-table whether $A \rightarrow B$, $A < B$ is valid.
(iv) What is the name of the standard implication in (iii) above?
(v) Find out by means of a truth-table whether \wedge is distributive over \rightarrow ; i.e. whether $A \wedge (B \rightarrow C) \succ (A \wedge B) \rightarrow (A \wedge C)$ is valid.
- c. In Effective Logic, no two of the three classically equivalent propositions $a \rightarrow b$, $\neg a \vee b$ and $\neg(a \wedge \neg b)$ are equivalent. Write these propositions in order, starting from the strongest and ending with the weakest.
- g. Given that propositions a and b are not truth-definite, state without proving, which, if any, of the following arguments is/are (i) effectively and/or (ii) classically sound.
(i) $\neg\neg a < a$
(ii) $a < \neg\neg a$
(iii) $\neg b \rightarrow \neg a < a \rightarrow b$
(iv) $a \rightarrow b < \neg b \rightarrow \neg a$
(v) $a \rightarrow b < \neg a \rightarrow \neg b$
(vi) $a \rightarrow b < \neg\neg b \rightarrow \neg\neg a$
- h. Find out by means of an effective scenario tableau whether the argument $a \vee b < \neg(\neg a \wedge \neg b)$ is effectively sound. (a and b are not truth-definite.)
- i. Find out by means of dialogues whether the argument $\neg(\neg a \wedge \neg b) < a \vee b$ is effectively and/or classically sound. (a and b are not truth-definite.)
- j. **Either**
Find out by means of a Beth tableau whether the argument $(a \wedge b) \vee (a \wedge c) < a \wedge (b \vee c)$ is classically sound.

Or

Find out by means of a dialogue-based development whether the argument $\neg(a \wedge b), a < \neg b$ is effectively and/or classically sound. (a and b are not truth-definite.)

- i. Give the simple and/or accidental converse, if any, of :
 - (i) No man is wise.
 - (ii) All men are wise.
 - j. Within Classical Logic 'proposition P is subcontrary to proposition Q' means $\neg P < Q$ is sound. What do the following mean?
 - (i) P is contrary to Q.
 - (ii) P is contradictory to Q.
 - j. Show by means of a Beth tableau that if the subject term S is nonempty, the proposition SiP is subcontrary to SoP i.e. that $\forall x S(x), \neg \forall x .S(x) \wedge P(x). < \forall x .S(x) \wedge \neg P(x)$.
 - j. Show by means of a Beth tableau that the 2nd figure syllogism *Baroco* is classically sound.
3. a. (i) $a \sqcup b$ is defined as $(a \wedge \neg b) \vee (\neg a \wedge b)$. Work out its truth-table.
(ii) Show by means of a truth-table that $a \sqcup b$ and $\neg(a \leftrightarrow b)$ are equivalent.
(iii) By means of a truth-table show that the Affirming the Consequent is fallacious, i.e. that $A \rightarrow B, B < A$ is invalid.
(iv) Find out by means of a truth-table whether the following Contraposition is valid : $A \rightarrow (B \vee C) >> \neg B \rightarrow (\neg A \vee C)$.
- b. (i) Given that the proposition a is not truth-definite, state without proving, whether each of the following propositions is (i) effective and/or (ii) classically true.
 - (1) $a \vee \neg a$
 - (2) $\neg(a \wedge \neg a)$
 - (ii) Give the standard name for each of the two propositions in b (i) above.
- f. In Effective Logic, the two classically equivalent propositions $a \vee b$ and $\neg(\neg a \wedge \neg b)$ are not equivalent. One who receives $a \vee b$ is able to assert about the 'original' sender something more than if one had instead received $\neg(\neg a \wedge \neg b)$. Explain in three or four lines.
 - g. Find out by means of an effective scenario tableau whether the argument $\neg a \vee b < a \rightarrow b$ is effectively sound. (a and b are not truth-definite.)
 - h. Find out by means of dialogues whether the argument $\neg(a \wedge b) < \neg a \vee \neg b$ is effectively and/or classically sound. (a and b are not truth-definite.)
- f. **Either**
Find out by means of a Beth tableau whether the argument $(a \vee b) \wedge (a \vee c) < a \vee (b \wedge c)$ is classically sound.

Or

Find out by means of a dialogue-based development whether the argument $a \vee b$, $\neg a < b$ is effectively and/or classically sound. (a and b are not truth-definite.)

g. Write down:

- (i) the contradictory, if any, of “Some man is wise”.
- (ii) the contrary, if any, of “Some man is wise”.
- (iii) the subcontrary, if any, of “Some man is wise”.
- (iv) the superaltern, if any, of “Some man is wise”.

h. Within Classical Logic, “proposition R is contrary to proposition S” means that $R < \neg S$ is sound. What do the following mean?

- (i) R is subcontrary to S.
- (ii) R is contradictory to S.

k. Show by means of a Beth tableau that if the predicate term P is occupied, the proposition SeP can be converted accidentally to the proposition PoS i.e.

$$\forall_x P(x), \wedge_x .S(x) \rightarrow \neg P(x). < \forall_x .P(x) \wedge \neg S(x).$$

l. Show by means of a Beth tableau that the 1st figure syllogism *Ferio* is classically sound.

Section B

3. Discuss Thomas Kuhn’s account of the development of scientific paradigms with particular reference to the validity of the criticism that it is relativistic and that it introduces an element of irrationality in the scientists’ decision to shift from one paradigm to another.
4. How successful was Imre Lakatos’ ‘Methodology of Scientific Research Programmes’ in reaching its aim to “explain and further strengthen Popper’s sophisticated falsification and present scientific revolutions not as constituting religious conversions but rather as rational progress”?
5. Discuss how issues relating to the theory-laden nature of observation bear upon the question of the scientific status of the social sciences.
6. Within a broader discussion concerning the relationship between structure and agency, discuss whether society is merely the sum of the individuals that make it up.
7. What is the difference between arithmetical objects (e.g. the natural numbers) and geometrical objects (e.g. the plane)?

Section C

8. “Though all attempts to define art in terms of necessary and sufficient conditions turn out in the end to be unsatisfactory, we can still learn a lot about the value of art from the theories that seek to defend such definitions.” Discuss with reference to either two or three of the following: (a) art as representation; (b) art as expression; (c) art as form; (d) art as institution.

9. "The linear or transmission model of communication needs to be framed within a context." Discuss.
10. "Human existence is always already situated." Discuss.
11. "Postmodern literature exacerbates the ontological foregrounding of texts." Discuss.
12. Outline the philosophical concepts communicated through an analysis of a film of your choice.



JUNE 2012 SESSION EXAMINATIONS

PHI3013 Synoptic Study-Unit IV: Philosophy

Wednesday 20th June 2012

9.15 – 12.15

NO DICTIONARIES ALLOWED

Answer any three questions.

1. “Though all our knowledge begins with experience, it does not follow that it all arises out of experience.” What does Kant mean by this?
2. Discuss the role of language as constitutive of our knowledge of the world.
3. How can one distinguish between cases of bodily movement in which there is an action on the part of the person and cases in which there is not?
4. Either (a) Aristotle claims that everyone wants to be happy. What is happiness? Is it the fulfilment of love, fidelity to laws or the maximization of communication?

Or (b) Which dimensions of human agency need to be taken into account in order to evaluate adequately the morality of human action?
5. Either (a) Discuss Alasdair MacIntyre’s claim that modern moral thought is in a state of disarray from which it can be rescued only if we revert to an Aristotelian paradigm.

Or (b) Show how Aristotle’s eudaimonism differs from classical utilitarianism.
6. Why should one obey the law? Can one ever be morally justified in breaking it? Illustrate your answer with examples.
7. Explain and discuss Rousseau’s theory of the ‘general will’.
8. “The mind is purely a function of the human brain.” Critically discuss this statement (which may be considered as a materialist hypothesis), illustrating your answer with some of the positions which philosophers take when they attempt to either verify or refute this hypothesis.
9. Describe the manner in which John McDowell attempts to ‘dissolve’ philosophical dualisms that arise when we reflect on the fundamental relation between mind and the world.

UNIVERSITY OF MALTA
FACULTY OF ARTS
M.A. Preparatory



JUNE 2012 SESSION EXAMINATIONS

PHI3140 Synoptic Study-Unit I: Philosophy

Monday 18th June 2012

9.15 – 12.15

NO DICTIONARIES ALLOWED

Answer any three questions.

1. Outline the philosophical concepts communicated through an analysis of a film of your choice.
2. Rather than 'grammar', vyakarana actually means 'deconstruction'. Why does Panini (500 b.c.) claim to be engaged in a process of deconstruction in his ashtahyayi?
3. "Heidegger's Dasein seeks utmost possibility by appropriating its heritage and its destiny. Levinas' ethical subject seeks freedom from the terror of the instant by taking on infinite responsibility for the other." Discuss.
4. By what means, in your opinion, is philosophical activity supported in Malta today, *and* what might be the principal liabilities besetting such an activity?
5. Sharing or Protecting? Creative Commons versus Copyright in cyberspace. Give a clear account of what is involved in the debate about the use of the Internet and other means of electronic communication in contemporary society.

UNIVERSITY OF MALTA
FACULTY OF ARTS
M.A. Preparatory



JUNE 2012 SESSION EXAMINATIONS

PHI3160 Synoptic Study-Unit II: Philosophy

Wednesday 20th June 2012

9.15 – 12.15

NO DICTIONARIES ALLOWED

Answer any three questions.

1. Discuss the Advaita philosophy of non-duality in the light of your reading of the Bhagavad Gita with Shankara's commentary.
2. Pierre Hadot says: "Socrates was the model of the ideal philosopher, whose philosophical work is none other than his life and death". Consider this in the light of the philosophy of Love as expounded in the *Symposium* dominated by the figure of Socrates.
3. "Knowledge' and 'certainty' belong to different *categories*. They are not two 'mental states' like, say 'surmising' and 'being sure'. [W]e are interested in the fact that about certain empirical propositions no doubt can exist if making judgments is to be possible at all. Or again: I am inclined to believe that not everything that has the form of an empirical proposition *is* one." (*On Certainty* §308) Discuss.
4. Outline and discuss the different ways in which philosophers of the environment ascribe value to nature. What difficulties are there with these views?
5. "Interesting philosophy is rarely an examination of the pros and cons of a thesis. Usually it is, implicitly or explicitly, a contest between an entrenched vocabulary which has become a nuisance and a half-formed new vocabulary which vaguely promises great things." (Richard Rorty). Discuss.