**Phil. 114 Final Exam – Info and questions – finalized 4/28/16**

Our final exam will be on Wednesday, May 11, 2:00-5:00 p.m.; in LC 103. You will have to answer three essay questions in the blue books that will be provided at the exam. All questions on the exam will be taken from the list below. Though excellent exams can be written in 2 hours, you will have 3 hours to complete your work. (You will have to turn in your work at 5:00, so these three hours include whatever “extra time” you may be entitled to.) You will be given some choice in which questions you will answer, and the test will be structured so that you can safely omit to prepare an answer to question 7 (if you wish) and to one of the other questions, and not get stuck with having to answer either of those questions.

Question 7 has a different status. It is very open-ended, and not directly based on any of our particular readings. Some of you may find you don’t have much to say in response to it—which is why I’m committing to your not having to answer it, and also to your still being able to choose one other question that you can safely omit to prepare an answer to. Others may find it would take more time to prepare an answer to #7 than to prepare other answers. In light that, I’ll also make this commitment: Question 7 *will* appear on the final as an option, so if you do prepare an answer to it, you can be sure you will get a chance to write that answer. (By contrast, each of the other questions is such that, for all you know, it will not appear on the final, even as option. Thus, for instance, you may prepare an answer to question 1, only to find it doesn’t appear on the actual final.)

1. Robert Adams and Middle Knowledge (reading #5): Explain

* what middle knowledge is
* Robert Adams’s “might” argument against middle knowledge
* Adams’s grounding argument against middle knowledge
* what seems to you the most serious objection to each of Adams’s above arguments

And critically evaluate Adams’s arguments in light of those objections.

2. Unger and the challenge of “scientiphicalism” (reading #4): Explain briefly what “scientiphicalism” is, according to Peter Unger and then explain

* why Unger thinks scientiphicalism threatens the thought that “often enough, we choose what to do from among actually available alternatives for our own activity
* why Unger thinks this challenge posed by scientiphicalism is more serious challenge than is the challenge presented by determinism
* how we might best think of our place in the world such as to avoid the challenge and retain the thought that we often make significant choices

3. Wykstra and his CORNEA principle (reading #7): Explain

* the intuitively powerful (at least according to your humble instructor) form of the problem of evil that Wykstra is responding to
* how Wykstra uses his CORNEA principle to combat that problem
* what Wykstra’s main conclusion is, and
* what you think is the most important objection to Wykstra’s case

Then critically assess the success of Wykstra’s argument

4.C.S. Lewis on hell (reading #11): Explain the main moves Lewis makes in defense of the doctrine of hell and critically evaluate his defense in light of what you take to be the strongest objections to it.

5. David Lewis on hell (reading #10): Explain the main moves Lewis makes in critiquing the doctrine of hell and critically evaluate his arguments in light of what you take to be the strongest objections to it.

6. Explain, in its most important aspects, Tarakis’s case (in our reading #8) against the project of constructing theodicies, making sure to explain what Trakakis takes theodicies to be. Then critically evaluate his argument in light of what you take to be the best objections that can be leveled against it.

7. Present in its strongest form an argument from evil that proceeds from a description of some of the most horrific and problematic instances of human suffering (and/or suffering of non-human animals), and appeals to the listener to “recognize” (as the arguer might put it) that it’s just extremely unlikely that a perfectly good God would allow such suffering—and suggests that those who fail to recognize this are failing to appreciate how horrific are the evils in question. Evaluate the intuitive and rational power of such a case in light of the best things that can be said against it.