

Directions: Our final is scheduled for Monday, May 7, at 7:00 p.m., and will be in LC 211 (note: **not** the room our class has been meeting in).

You will have to answer three of the below nine questions on the final exam, and no question will be asked that is not listed below. You won't know until the time of the exam which questions will appear, but I will promise that there will be some choice, and that the test will be structured so that you can safely neglect to prepare an answer for one of the nine questions. Some possibilities (ordered from nastiest to nicest): a) I choose four of the below nine questions to appear, and you must choose three of those four to answer; b) I choose eight of the below questions to appear, I divide them into three groups, and you are instructed to answer one question from each group; c) all nine of the below questions appear, and you can choose any three of them to answer. There are also lots of other possibilities, but you know this: you will be asked nothing that's not on the below list of questions, and to be safe, you must prepare to answer each of them, except for one.

You are, of course, encouraged to make use of both your course books and your notes in preparing for the exam, but at the time of the exam, you will have to write your answers from memory, without the aid of books or notes. Exam books to write your answers in will be provided at the exam. Don't bring any bluebooks into the class with you. You will have two-and-a-half hours to complete the exam, but I would expect that a good job could be done in two hours. [Fine print: Yale regulations state: "Final examinations normally last either two or three hours but, in either case, students are permitted to take an additional half-hour before being required to turn in their answers. This additional time is given for improving what has already been written, rather than for breaking new ground." Our exam officially lasts for 2 hours. That, plus the half-hour of extra time, which is perhaps used wrapping up your work, yields the total of 2-1/2 hours that you have before work must be turned in. Bottom line: Your work must be turned in by 9:30, and at that point, your half-hour of extra time has already been used.]

You may find that answering these questions well requires you not only to remember what you read and were told, but to actually think about the issues for yourself. That is by design.

1. Under what conditions do we act freely, according to Locke? Can we act freely on Locke's view if we are causally determined to act as we do by forces over which we have no control? Explain what you take to be the most important objection to Locke's account of free action, and evaluate his account in light of that objection.
2. Briefly explain Berkeley's account of the nature of physical objects ("bodies"). Someone might object to this account by claiming that, on it, Berkeley cannot successfully draw a "distinction between realities and chimeras" (Principles, section 34). Explain and critically assess Berkeley's attempt to draw the distinction in question, and evaluate the force of the objection in light of Berkeley's attempt to meet it.

3. Explain what we have called Berkeley's "inconceivability argument." What does Berkeley claim is inconceivable? And why does he think it is? Explain the different ways of understanding Berkeley that we discussed. Evaluate the success of Berkeley's argument in light of what you take to be the most serious challenge(s) to it.
4. Briefly explain, in paragraph form, the Humean argument we have discussed to the conclusion that I have no good reason to believe that my eraser will fall when released. One might think that Kant's claim that we have synthetic *a priori* knowledge, and his defense of that claim, provides a defense against that Humean argument. At what point in the Humean argument might Kant's claim be thought to provide relief, and how? Do you think that Kant's claim and his defense of it provide for a successful response to the Humean argument? Discuss, defend, explain.
5. In what way, according to Hume, do the ideas one is capable of having relate to the impressions one has had? What arguments does Hume give for this claim? How would/does Reid respond to these arguments? Are Hume's arguments successful? Are Reid's responses successful? Explain and defend your answer.
6. According to Reid, a certain kind of sensation of touch is needed for us to acquire the "conception of hardness" (R, p. 58) and the occurrence of such a sensation often informs us that we are in contact with a hard object. What is Reid's account of how we get from such a sensation to the conception of hardness and a belief that we are touching a hard object? Do we, according to Reid, believe that the hard object is like the tactile sensation which produces our belief? Explain. A sceptic might claim that, for all we know, and for all that we're justified in believing, this belief (in the existence of a hard object) that we typically form on the occasion of having such sensations is false. Carefully explain Reid's response to such a sceptic.
7. Compare and contrast Reid's account of the "common" or "vulgar" belief in the mind-independent existence of bodies with the account of Berkeley and Hume. Hume claims that the "vulgar" are never aware of a "double existence" of sensations and objects. How might Reid make use of his theory of sensations as "signs" to answer Hume on this point? Which account of the "common" belief do you find to be the more plausible? Explain.
8. Kant describes himself as an "empirical realist" but a "transcendental idealist." What does this mean? Why does Kant hold these positions?
9. Explain Kant's reasons for thinking that "Space does not represent any property of things in themselves" (B42, p. 71 of K) and for making a similar claim about time (see esp. B49, p. 76 of K). Compare Kant's position with a position that agrees with Kant that space and time are *a priori* "forms of sensible intuition," but according to which real objects, things in themselves, really have spatial and temporal properties -- a position according to which we are *a priori* set up to discern spatial and temporal properties that the things in themselves really have. Which position -- Kant's, or some form of the opposing position I've just described -- is more rational and/or defensible? Explain and defend your answer.