

UNIVERSITY OF MALTA  
FACULTY OF ARTS  
DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY



JUNE 2014 SESSION EXAMINATIONS  
B.A., B.A.(Hons), B.Comm.(Hons)

PHI3010 Synoptic Study-Unit I: Philosophy

Friday 6<sup>th</sup> June 2014

13.00 – 16.00

---

Answer any **THREE** questions.

1. Discuss the contribution made by the Presocratics to the birth of science and philosophy.
2. Explain and discuss Plato's theory of Forms.
3. Is there such a thing as a 'Christian philosophy'? Discuss with particular reference to Medieval thought.
4. The two pillars of Medieval philosophy, Augustine and Thomas Aquinas, both tried to understand the relationship between reason and faith. Discuss.
5. Bring out some of the salient features of British Empiricism by discussing the work of any two philosophers you have studied.
6. Kant claimed that he had brought about a 'Copernican Revolution' in philosophy. Describe the contents of this 'revolution' and examine its effects.
7. Twentieth century western philosophy has been described as a reaction to Hegelianism. Do you agree with this description? Give reasons.
8. Critically examine the key concepts of language introduced by at least *two* contemporary western philosophers.

UNIVERSITY OF MALTA  
FACULTY OF ARTS  
DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY



JUNE 2014 SESSION EXAMINATIONS  
B.A., B.Comm.(Hons)

PHI3011 Synoptic Study-Unit II: Philosophy  
12<sup>th</sup> June 2014

Thursday

13.00 – 16.00

---

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)  $a \sqcup b$  is defined as  $(a \sqcap b) \sqcup (a \sqcup \neg b)$ . 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) Find out by means of a *truth-table* whether the  $\sqcup$  is self-distributive, i.e. whether  $A \sqcup (B \sqcup C) \leftrightarrow (A \sqcup B) \sqcup (A \sqcup C)$  is valid.
- (iv) By means of a *truth-table* show that the Modus Ponens implication is valid, i.e. that  $A \sqcap B \rightarrow A \rightarrow B$  is valid.
- (v) Give the name of another valid standard implication which has two premises, one of which is the same as the 1<sup>st</sup> premise of the implication in (iv) above.
- b. Given that the proposition  $a$  is not truth-definite for each of the propositions below
- (i) state without proving whether they are effectively and/or classically true
- (ii) give their standard name:
- (1)  $a \sqcap \neg a$                       (2)  $\neg\neg a \sqcap \neg a$
- c. Given that propositions  $a$  and  $b$  are not truth-definite, state without proving, which, if any, of the following arguments are effectively and/or classically sound.
- (i)  $\neg\neg a \rightarrow a$
- (ii)  $a \rightarrow \neg\neg a$
- (iii)  $\neg b \rightarrow \neg\neg a \rightarrow a \sqcap b$
- (iv)  $a \sqcap b \rightarrow \neg b \sqcap \neg a$
- (v)  $a \sqcap b \rightarrow \neg a \sqcap \neg b$
- (vi)  $a \sqcap b \rightarrow \neg\neg b \sqcap \neg\neg a$

- d. Find out by means of an *effective scenario tableau* whether the argument  $\Box a \Box b < a \Box b$   $\Box \Box \Box$  is effectively sound. (a and b are not truth-definite.)
- e. Find out by means of *dialogues* whether the argument  $a \Box \Box b \Box c < \Box a \Box b \Box \Box \Box a \Box c$  is effectively and/or classically sound. (a, b and c are not truth-definite.)
- f. Find out by means of a *dialogue-based development* whether the argument  $\Box \Box \Box \Box a \Box b$  ,,  $\Box b < a$  is effectively and/or classically sound. (a and b are not truth-definite.)
- g. Give the simple and/or accidental converse, if any, of :  
 (i) No man is wise.            (ii) Some man is wise.
- h. Within Classical Logic ‘proposition P is subcontrary to proposition Q’ means  $\Box P < Q$  is sound. What do the following mean?  
 (i) P is contrary to Q.        (ii) P is contradictory to Q.
- i. Show by means of a *Beth tableau* that if the subject term S is nonempty, the proposition  $\Box \Box \Box \Box a \Box b$  is subcontrary to  $\Box \Box \Box \Box a \Box b$  i.e. that  $\Box \Box \Box \Box a \Box b$  ,,  $\Box \Box \Box \Box a \Box b$   $< \Box \Box \Box \Box a \Box b$  is classically sound.
- j. Show by means of a *Beth tableau* that if the middle term M is nonempty, the 3<sup>rd</sup> figure syllogism *Felapton* is classically sound.
2. a. (i)  $a * b$  is defined as  $a \Box \Box b$ . Work out its *truth-table*.  
 (ii) Show by means of a *truth-table* that  $a * b$  and  $\Box \Box \Box a \Box b$  are equivalent.  
 (iii) Find out by means of a *truth-table* whether the following Transportation is valid:  
 $A \Box \Box (\Box B \Box C) \gg (A \Box \Box C) \Box \Box \Box \Box B$   
 (iv) Find out by means of a *truth-table* whether Affirming the Consequent is valid, i.e. whether  $A \Box B$  ,,  $B < A$  is valid  
 (v) Give the name of a valid standard implication which has two premises, one of which is the same as the 1<sup>st</sup> premise of the implication in (iv) above.  
 (vi) Write in symbols the valid standard implication given as answer in (v) above.
- b. In Effective Logic, no two of the three classically equivalent propositions  $a \Box b$ ,  $\Box a \Box b$  and  $\Box(a \Box \Box b)$  are equivalent. Write these propositions in order, starting from the strongest and ending with the weakest.
- c. In Effective Logic, the two classically equivalent propositions  $a \Box b$  and  $\Box(\Box a \Box \Box b)$  are not equivalent. One who receives  $a \Box b$  is able to assert about the ‘original’ sender something more than if one had instead received  $\Box(\Box a \Box \Box b)$ . Explain in three or four

lines.

- d. Find out by means of *effective scenario tableaux* whether the argument  $\Box\Box\Box a\Box\Box b < a\Box b$  is effectively sound. (a and b are not truth-definite.)
- e. Find out by means of *dialogues* whether the argument  $a\Box\Box b\Box c < (a\Box b)\Box(a\Box c)$  is effectively and/or classically sound. (a, b and c are not truth-definite.)
- f. Find out by means of *dialogue-based developments* whether the argument  $\Box\Box\Box\Box\Box\Box a\Box b < \Box b\Box a$  is effectively and/or classically sound. (a and b are not truth-definite.)
- g. Write down in words:  
(i) the contradictory (ii) the contrary (iii) the subcontrary (iv) the superaltern, if any, of “Some man is not wise”.
- h. Within Classical Logic, ‘proposition R is contrary to proposition S’ means that  $R < \Box S$  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  $\text{SeP}$  can be converted accidentally to the proposition  $\text{PoS}$  i.e. that  $\Box_x P(x)\Box, \Box_x \Box .S(x)\Box\Box\Box\Box\Box P(x).\Box < \Box_x .P(x)\Box\Box\Box\Box\Box S(x).$  is classically sound.
- j. Show by means of a *Beth tableau* that if the middle term M is occupied, the 4<sup>th</sup> figure syllogism *Fesapo* is classically sound.

## **Section B**

3. Either: (a) Suppose you were engaged in a discussion on the meaning of moral goodness among subjectivists and objectivists. Which position would you defend? Which arguments would you put forward to support your position?  
Or: (b) Discuss how human action is the result of both *intellect* and *will*.
4. Either: (a) Do you agree with 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) Discuss Kant’s claim that the morally good person is the one who strives to do what he/she *ought* to do rather than the one who acts either from *inclination* or *self-interest*.
5. “Perception is one of our principal sources of information about the world, even though we often tend to take it for granted.” Do you agree with this assertion? Give reasons.

6. "Language is not just a matter of convention, but it must also reflect the world." Discuss.
7. Elucidate philosophically the common-sense distinction between intentional and non-intentional action.
8. What should the state do? Which responsibilities should we look to the state to fulfil and which ones should be left in the hands of private individuals?
9. Compare and contrast the views of Thomas Hobbes and John Locke on the state of nature.
10. Either: (a) "Neither induction nor falsification provides sufficient grounds for proving or disproving scientific theories." Discuss.  
  
Or: (b) "Karl Popper and Thomas Kuhn suggest contrasting approaches to an understanding of the growth of scientific knowledge." Discuss.
11. Either: (a) How would you explain the relation of metaphysics to that of any other science of your choice?  
  
Or: (b) How do the notions of act and potency enable us to understand change?
12. Show how the *five ways* constitute a multifaceted reflection on the ultimate necessary explanation in order for the universe, or some observed feature of the universe, to exist.
13. "Historically, different aesthetic theories have proposed different accounts of what it is that all works of art share which gives them their value." Critically examine any *two* such theories.
14. Outline the conditions that must obtain for communicative interaction to take place.
15. Dualist solutions to the mind-body problem attempt to address the issue of how consciousness and other so-called mental states could arise from the human brain. Critically discuss the philosophical problems that arise when considering the mind-body problem from a dualist perspective, with particular emphasis on the manner in which dualism addresses human mental activity.
16. Discuss the manner in which John McDowell attempts to 'show' how 'concepts mediate the relation between minds and the world' in *Mind and World*.

UNIVERSITY OF MALTA  
FACULTY OF ARTS  
DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY



JUNE 2014 SESSION EXAMINATIONS  
B.A. (Hons)

PHI3012 Synoptic Study-Unit III : Philosophy

Thursday 12<sup>th</sup> June 2014

13.00 – 16.00

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.

1. a. (i)  $a \sqcup b$  is defined as  $(a \sqcap b) \sqcup (a \sqcup b)$ . 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) Find out by means of a *truth-table* whether the  $\sqcup$  is self-distributive, i.e. whether

$A \sqcup (B \sqcup C) \succ (A \sqcup B) \sqcup (A \sqcup C)$  is valid.

(iv) By means of a *truth-table* show that the Modus Ponens implication is valid, i.e. that

$A \sqsupset B, A \vdash B$  is valid.

(v) Give the name of another valid standard implication which has two premises, one of

which is the same as the 1<sup>st</sup> premise of the implication in (iv) above.

b. Given that the proposition  $a$  is not truth-definite for each of the propositions below

(i) state without proving whether they are effectively and/or classically true

(ii) give their standard name:

(1)  $a \sqcap \neg a$

(2)  $\neg(a \sqcap \neg a)$

c. Given that propositions  $a$  and  $b$  are not truth-definite, state without proving, which, if any,

of the following arguments are effectively and/or classically sound.

(i)  $\neg(a \sqcap \neg a) \vdash a$

(ii)  $a \vdash \neg(a \sqcap \neg a)$

(iii)  $\neg b \vdash (a \sqcap \neg a) \vdash a \sqcap b$

(iv)  $a \sqcap b \vdash \neg b \sqcap \neg a$

(v)  $a \sqcap b \vdash \neg a \sqcap \neg b$

(vi)  $a \sqcap b \vdash \neg\neg b \sqcap \neg\neg a$

- k. Find out by means of an *effective scenario tableau* whether the argument  $\Box a \Box b < a \Box b$  is effectively sound. (a and b are not truth-definite.)
- l. Find out by means of *dialogues* whether the argument  $a \Box b \Box c < \Box a \Box b \Box c$  is effectively and/or classically sound. (a, b and c are not truth-definite.)
- m. Find out by means of a *dialogue-based development* whether the argument  $\Box \Box \Box a \Box b$  ,,  $\Box b < a$  is effectively and/or classically sound. (a and b are not truth-definite.)
- n. Give the simple and/or accidental converse, if any, of :  
 (i) No man is wise.           (ii) Some man is wise.
- o. Within Classical Logic ‘proposition P is subcontrary to proposition Q’ means  $\Box P < Q$  is sound. What do the following mean?  
 (i) P is contrary to Q.       (ii) P is contradictory to Q.
- p. Show by means of a *Beth tableau* that if the subject term S is nonempty, the proposition  $\Box x S(x)$  is subcontrary to  $\Box x \Box S(x) \Box P(x)$  i.e. that  $\Box x S(x)$  ,,  $\Box \Box x \Box S(x) \Box P(x) < \Box x S(x) \Box \Box P(x)$  is classically sound.
- q. Show by means of a *Beth tableau* that if the middle term M is nonempty, the 3<sup>rd</sup> figure syllogism *Felapton* is classically sound.
2. a. (i)  $a * b$  is defined as  $a \Box \Box b$ . Work out its *truth-table*.  
 (ii) Show by means of a *truth-table* that  $a * b$  and  $\Box \Box a \Box b$  are equivalent.  
 (iii) Find out by means of a *truth-table* whether the following Transportation is valid:  
 $A \Box (\Box B \Box C) \gg (A \Box \Box C) \Box \Box \Box B$   
 (iv) Find out by means of a *truth-table* whether Affirming the Consequent is valid, i.e. whether  $A \Box B$  ,,  $B < A$  is valid  
 (v) Give the name of a valid standard implication which has two premises, one of which is the same as the 1<sup>st</sup> premise of the implication in (iv) above.  
 (vi) Write in symbols the valid standard implication given as answer in (v) above.
- b. In Effective Logic, no two of the three classically equivalent propositions  $a \Box b$ ,  $\Box a \Box b$  and  $\Box (a \Box \Box b)$  are equivalent. Write these propositions in order, starting from the strongest and ending with the weakest.
- c. In Effective Logic, the two classically equivalent propositions  $a \Box b$  and  $\Box (\Box a \Box \Box b)$  are not equivalent. One who receives  $a \Box b$  is able to assert about the ‘original’ sender something more than if one had instead received  $\Box (\Box a \Box \Box b)$ . Explain in three or four lines.

- d. Find out by means of *effective scenario tableaux* whether the argument  $\Box\Box\Box a \Box\Box b < a \Box b$  is effectively sound. (a and b are not truth-definite.)
- g. Find out by means of *dialogues* whether the argument  $a \Box\Box b \Box c < (a \Box b) \Box (a \Box c)$  is effectively and/or classically sound. (a, b and c are not truth-definite.)
- h. Find out by means of *dialogue-based developments* whether the argument  $\Box\Box\Box\Box\Box\Box a \Box b < \Box b \Box a$  is effectively and/or classically sound. (a and b are not truth-definite.)
- g. Write down in words:  
 (i) the contradictory (ii) the contrary (iii) the subcontrary (iv) the superaltern, if any, of “Some man is not wise”.
- k. Within Classical Logic, ‘proposition R is contrary to proposition S’ means that  $R < \Box S$  is sound. What do the following mean?  
 (i) R is subcontrary to S. (ii) R is contradictory to S.
- l. Show by means of a *Beth tableau* that if the predicate term P is occupied, the proposition  $\Box_e P$  can be converted accidentally to the proposition  $\Box_o S$  i.e. that  $\Box_x P(x), \Box_x .S(x) \Box\Box\Box\Box P(x) < \Box_x .P(x) \Box\Box\Box\Box S(x)$  is classically sound.
- m. Show by means of a *Beth tableau* that if the middle term M is occupied, the 4<sup>th</sup> figure syllogism *Fesapo* is classically sound.

## **Section B**

3. “Neither induction nor falsification provides sufficient grounds for proving or disproving scientific theories.” Discuss.
4. “Karl Popper and Thomas Kuhn suggest contrasting approaches to an understanding of the growth of scientific knowledge.” Discuss.
5. Making reference to the problematic about the theory-laden nature of observation, discuss in what sense the social sciences can be understood as ‘scientific’.
6. Discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the competing positions of the Structuralist/Agency debate and explain how a ‘dialectical’ perspective attempts a resolution to the debate.
7. “There are different kinds of mathematical objects. Thus, for example, while the natural numbers are *abstract* objects, the planes are *ideal* objects.” Discuss this statement which represents the position of constructive philosophers of science.

### **Section C**

8. “Historically, different aesthetic theories have proposed different accounts of what it is that all works of art share which gives them their value.” Critically examine any *two* such theories.
9. Outline the conditions that must obtain for communicative interaction to take place.
10. In what way can it be said that Existentialism is a philosophy that helps us understand human existence?
11. “The medium of film can be utilized to communicate philosophical views.” Discuss with reference to a film of your choice.

UNIVERSITY OF MALTA  
FACULTY OF ARTS  
DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY



JUNE 2014 SESSION EXAMINATIONS  
B.A. (Hons)

PHI3013 Synoptic Study-Unit IV: Philosophy

Thursday 19<sup>th</sup> June 2014

13.00 – 16.00

---

Answer any **THREE** questions.

1. “The philosophy of perception is concerned with the nature of perceptual experience and the status of perceptual data, in particular how they relate to beliefs about, or knowledge of, the world.” (*Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy* – online edition). Do you consider this statement to be too general? Give reasons for your answer.
2. “It is amazing that amid the clutter of the world, humans stand out as unique organisms, endowed with that very important tool which is language.” Discuss.
3. “I am very partial to ice cream, and a bombe is served divided into segments corresponding one to one with the persons at High Table: I am tempted to help myself to two segments and do so, thus succumbing to temptation and even conceivably (but why necessarily?) going against my principles. But do I lose control of myself? Do I raven, do I snatch the morsels from the dish and wolf them down, impervious to the consternation of my colleagues? Not a bit of it. We often succumb to temptation with calm and even with finesse.” Comment on the possibility of *akrasia* with reference to J.L Austin’s memorable example.
4. Either: (a) Discuss Aristotle’s claim in *Nicomachean Ethics*, that “every expertise and method of investigation, and likewise every action and choice, seem to aim at some good; hence the good has been well described as that at which all things aim”.  
  
Or: (b) What is happiness? Is it the fulfillment of love, fidelity to laws or the maximisation of our communication?
5. Either: (a) Do you agree that Aquinas’ moral theory cannot be understood without Aristotle’s philosophy? Give reasons for your answer.  
  
Or: (b) Discuss how Aristotle’s eudaimonism differs from classical utilitarianism.
6. “From the communitarian perspective, the central defect of liberalism is its view of the individual as an asocial, atomized, ‘unencumbered self’.” Discuss.
7. Compare and contrast the views of John Rawls and Richard Nozick on justice.
8. Discuss the manner in which monist theories of mind attempt to overcome the intuitive notion that the ‘mental’ is somehow fundamentally different from the ‘physical’, providing specific examples for your claims.
9. Critically discuss the manner in which John McDowell attempts to ‘dissolve’ philosophical problems related to the dualism of reason and nature with his introduction of the concept of ‘second nature’ in *Mind and World*.

UNIVERSITY OF MALTA  
FACULTY OF ARTS  
DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY

JUNE 2014 SESSION EXAMINATIONS  
B.A. (Hons)

PHI3111 Synoptic Study-Unit II: Philosophy

Tuesday 10<sup>th</sup> June 2014

09.15 – 12.15

---

Answer ONE question.

1. Is it true, as Peter Serracino Inglott claimed, that “pure chance cannot account for the behaviour of fruit and other things, inanimate or animate, which lack reason and therefore cannot themselves be making deliberate choices, to be patterned as if they were, despite impediments, seeking to maximise their communicating possibilities”?  
“When I say ‘God exists’, I am making a statement rather more about the world than about God” (Peter Serracino Inglott). Could one apprehend the world as a whole in this way? If so, could one, in “apprehend[ing] the world as the language with which the unknown X that we call God makes His presence somehow known”, express through language this surprising Presence?  
Could a hypothesis of cyclical return, such as upheld by Nietzsche, be an alternative to the existence of “some being having of itself its own necessity and not receiving it from another, but rather causing in others their necessity” (Thomas Aquinas’ *Third Way*)?
2. “For what is time? Who can readily and briefly explain this? Who can even in thought comprehend it, so as to utter a word about it? But what in discourse do we mention more familiarly and knowingly, than time? And, we understand, when we speak of it; we understand also, when we hear it spoken of by another. What then is time? If no one asks me, I know: if I wish to explain it to one that asks, I know not” (Augustine’s *Confessions*).  
Does time exist? If so, how? Does time actually ‘pass’?  
Is the present metaphysically privileged in some way, or is the present just like the past and the future?  
Do objects perdure or do they endure?